

Durham E-Theses

The church colleges 1890-1944, with special reference to the church of England colleges and the role of the national society

Boyd, Michael V.

How to cite:

Boyd, Michael V. (1981) *The church colleges 1890-1944, with special reference to the church of England colleges and the role of the national society*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/7517/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Academic Support Office, Durham University, University Office, Old Elvet, Durham DH1 3HP
e-mail: e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk>

THE CHURCH COLLEGES 1890-1944,
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND COLLEGES
AND THE ROLE OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the University of Durham
School of Education
by
MICHAEL V. BOYD

1981



17 MAY 1984

ABSTRACT

THE CHURCH COLLEGES 1890-1944, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND COLLEGES AND THE ROLE OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY

Michael V. Boyd

The history of the Church colleges between 1890 and 1944 can be seen in terms of challenge and response. This study is concerned to examine the similar and different ways in which the denominational colleges responded to three challenges with which they were confronted in this period.

The first challenge arose from the entry of the universities into the sphere of Elementary teacher-training in 1890 and the further erosion of the Voluntary monopoly by the Local Authorities after 1902. The second challenge was an attack on denominational exclusiveness, and the tension inherent in the situation in which colleges of the Established Church were part of an increasingly secular national education system is examined. The third, and most serious, was the challenge to survive in financial and therefore physical terms, in the face of Local Authority competition, through two World Wars, and with rapid changes of Government policy largely brought on by economic difficulties in the inter-war period.

Central to this study is an examination of the machinery for the central administration of the Church of England colleges, which emerged in response to those challenges, and the study of the continuing but changing role of the National Society in relation to the colleges and their organisation. The nature and extent of the authority of the central organisation, as compared with its Roman Catholic and Methodist counterparts, is explored, together with the tension between the local and the central, which marked and marred the relationship of the individual colleges with the policy-making body.

PREFACE

At the time of the publication of the Report of the Cross Commission in 1888, the Voluntary monopoly of teacher-training was intact. There was college accommodation for about 1,600 students each year. The six colleges of the British and Foreign School Society, together with Edgehill and Homerton, accounted for just under 20% of available places. The remainder were in denominational colleges, with the Church of England having just over 66% of total places, in thirty colleges, the Roman Catholic Church in its three colleges having just over 7% and the Wesleyan Methodist Church just over 7% in its two colleges.¹

The Voluntary monopoly was lost in 1890, but its total of Two-Year colleges and places provided was not overtaken by L.E.A. providing bodies until after 1944. It is with the fortunes and misfortunes of the denominational colleges in this period, and especially with those of the group of Church of England colleges which in 1890 were providing places for two-thirds of all candidates, that this study is concerned. The denominations did not always react in exactly the same way to the challenges and changing circumstances of the period, because the organisation and control of teacher-training within the different denominations did not follow an identical pattern.

It is to a consideration of the organisation of the colleges in the last decade of the nineteenth century that we now turn.

1 S. Birchenough (1929) A History of Elementary Education in England and Wales, p. 448.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	i
Preface	ii
1. <u>THE TRAINING COLLEGES AT THE END OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY</u>	
1 The Church of England Colleges	1
2 The Role of the National Society	7
3 Roman Catholic Colleges and Organisation	15
4 Methodist Colleges and Organisation	20
5 The Undenominational Colleges	25
2. <u>CHALLENGE 1890-1914</u>	
I <u>The Challenge of the Day Training Colleges</u>	
1 The Day Training Colleges	30
2 Academic Work and Recruitment of Staff	41
3 The Undenominational Challenge	47
4 College Life	52
5 The National Society and a College Initiative	63
II <u>The Local Authority Challenge</u>	
1 The Local Authority Colleges	69
2 The Reaction of the Church of England Colleges	75
3 The Colleges' Response	81
4 Religious Knowledge	87
5 Changed Conditions	95
6 The National Society	101
III <u>The Government Challenge</u>	
1 The 1907 Regulations	106
2 The Methodist and Roman Catholic Reaction	112
3 The Church of England Reaction	119
4 The Settlement	129
5 The Working of the Modus Vivendi	135

	Page
3. <u>THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND AFTERMATH</u>	
I <u>The War Years</u>	
1 Enlistment and Church of England Attitudes	147
2 Concentration: The Church of England Colleges for Men	155
3 Other Colleges in the War Years	174
4 The Wakefield Commission	182
II <u>Post-War Difficulties</u>	
1 The Board of Supervision and the Board of Education	203
2 The Board of Supervision and the Colleges	217
3 The Roman Catholic Colleges in the Post-War Years	228
III <u>The Beginning of Recovery</u>	
1 The National Society and other Central Bodies of the Church of England	236
2 The Firstfruits of Co-operation	244
3 The Need for Scheme II	253
IV <u>The Colleges and the Report of the Departmental Committee 1925</u>	
1 The University Connection	258
2 Circular 1372 and the Negotiations: The Church of England Colleges	265
3 The Negotiations: The Roman Catholic and Methodist Colleges	274
4. <u>THE STRUGGLE FOR SURVIVAL 1929-1939</u>	
I <u>The Calm Before the Storm</u>	
1 The Mayor Report	281
2 Hopeful Signs	286

	Page
II <u>The Storm</u>	
1 Hope Deferred	295
2 A Crisis of Confidence	304
3 The Committee of Enquiry	318
4 Concentration After All	332
III <u>Administrative Changes</u>	
1 The Board of Supervision	345
2 The National Society as the Central Council for Religious Education	358
IV <u>How the Other Denominational Colleges Fared</u>	
1 Common Problems	368
5. <u>PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE 1939-1944</u>	
1 War Moves	382
2 The Church of England Colleges: The Need for Administrative Change	398
3 A Role for the Future	412
Postscript	427
Appendix: The Church Colleges	429
Bibliography	433

PART 1

THE TRAINING COLLEGES AT THE
END OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

CHAPTER 1

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND COLLEGES

The thirty Church of England Colleges in existence in 1890 witness to the dominating role which the Church played in the provision of teacher-training. They did not, however, owe their creation to any decision of a central policy-making body of the Church, and within the group of seventeen institutions for women and thirteen for men there were some colleges which stood out as markedly different in outlook from the majority.

Most of the colleges had been founded in the boom period which began in 1843 under the stimulus of government grants in aid of building, and which ended in 1860 with the withdrawal of such grants. Only Chichester, Oxford and Tottenham, all for women, belonged to the period of expansion which followed the 1870 Education Act.

Twelve of the women's colleges and nine of those for men were the result of diocesan enterprise, and were managed by their own Governing Bodies.¹ Oxford, opened in 1872, was in private hands until 1897 when it was assigned to trustees for use as a Diocesan

1 For women: Bishop's Stortford, Brighton, Bristol, Chichester, Derby, Durham, Lincoln, Norwich, Ripon, Salisbury, Truro, Warrington. For men: Chester, Caernarvon, Culham, Durham, Exeter, Peterborough, Saltley, Winchester, York. The building at Caernarvon was badly damaged by fire in 1891. The college re-opened in Bangor in 1893 and shortly afterwards became a college for women. J. Fairchild (1938) History of the Church Training College at Caernarvon and Bangor, pp. 7-8.



Training College.¹ By 1890 most had ceased to be diocesan in terms of intake and had become regional if not national institutions, though still relying on local support.² Chichester, founded in 1873, deliberately set its sights beyond the diocese in seeking to attract candidates of superior social position whose previous education had been somewhat wider than that of the pupil-teacher, and at the time of the Cross Commission there had been only one girl from Sussex in the college, most students coming from the North.³

Three of the colleges were the direct responsibility of the National Society, which had been founded in 1811 'for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established

1 National Society, Oxford Felstead House Correspondence: Report of visit of National Society Assistant Secretary, 22.12.1911.

2 At Lincoln in the 1890s the diocesan character was still to the fore and the college came under criticism from the Inspectors for not admitting the best candidates in consequence. See D.H.J. Zebedee (1962) Lincoln Training College, 1862-1962, p. 68.

3 Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the working of the Education Acts: (1886) (Cross) First Report, Minutes of Evidence, p. 498. The original foundation was in 1850 as a college for men. It was forced to close as a result of a decline in male candidates after the Revised Code, in 1868. The new Scheme approved by the Charity Commissioners in 1873 was for the training of 'daughters of clergymen, professional men and others as teachers in Elementary Schools'. See T.G. Willis (1928) Records of Chichester, p. 275.

Church'.¹ St. Mark's, Chelsea, and Whitelands had been established in 1840 and 1841 respectively, and Battersea had been handed over to the Society by its founders, James Kay and E. Carleton Tufnell, in 1843. The colleges had been managed by sub-committees of the Society in their earliest years but responsibility had been handed over to their own college Councils by 1850 with an annual grant from the Society. They were responsible for the day to day running, nevertheless the financial links with the parent Society remained very close. The London colleges of the Society were distinctly national in appeal from their beginning, and their standing 'as models for other like Institutions' made their continued financial support by the Society essential.² The training college at Carmarthen was also the property of the National Society, with its government vested in a General Committee which included the Society's Standing Committee and officials of the dioceses of Llandaff and St. David's. The college was administered by a Council representing diocesan interests which was appointed at the annual meeting of the

1 The Society represented a different view of religious education from that of the supporters of Joseph Lancaster. It held that religious instruction was useless unless it included training in membership of a Church. Therefore the 'National religion should be made the foundation of National Education and should be the first and chief thing taught to the Poor, according to the excellent Liturgy and Catechism provided by our Church'. Report of founding meeting 1811, quoted in H.J. Burgess (1958) Enterprise in Education, p. 23.

2 National Society: Annual Report, 1864, p. vii.

General Committee held at the National Society's office, and which reported to the National Society.¹

In addition, the Society had joined with the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, in 1877, to promote another college for women, which opened in Tottenham in the following year, in temporary accommodation but with buildings planned.² The National Society then decided it could not afford its original commitment of £8,000 and withdrew from the enterprise, leaving sole responsibility to the S.P.C.K. but making a donation of £2,000.³

The emphasis of the two establishments founded as a joint institution at Cheltenham in 1847 was somewhat different. The driving force behind the enterprise was Francis Close, the Evangelical vicar of the town.⁴ Under his influence the supporters decided that the Training School should be 'neither local, nor diocesan, nor territorial in its operations' but that it should be 'an institution for the training of pious masters and mistresses upon Scriptural and Evangelical principles in connection with the

1 Training College Commission (1916) (Wakefield) Report, p. 27.

2 G. Handley (1978) The College of All Saints, 1878-1978, p. 4.

3 W.K. Clarke (1959) A History of the S.P.C.K., p. 161.

4 Francis Close was one of the considerable body of Evangelical clergy who, in 1851, finding the High Church element in the National Society too strong for them, formed a separate Society, the Church Education Society. See O. Chadwick (1966) The Victorian Church, Part 1, p. 345. Support of the establishments at Cheltenham would have had a direct appeal to members of the Society.

Church of England'. The national and ecclesiastical character of the college was ensured by the cumbersome device of having two-hundred life Governors, half of whom were clergy, in addition to a Managing Committee.¹

The earliest of the training colleges to be founded for women, in 1836, was that of the Home and Colonial Infant School Society, in the Gray's Inn Road, London. It was in connection with the Church of England but was the least denominational in character. It had no large religious body supporting it, and though it adhered to principles 'set forth and embodied in the doctrinal articles of the Church of England', the college accepted candidates of other religious denominations, 'if holding the fundamental truths of the Bible and of decided piety'.² In its doctrinal teaching 'controversial points are specially avoided with the Archbishop's sanction'.³

The Church of England group of colleges was thus not an entirely homogeneous group, neither as regards management and control, nor, in a Church as theologically comprehensive as the Church of England, in the matter of churchmanship. We must not assume that all the diocesan colleges were of High Church persuasion.

-
- 1 E.B. Challinor (1978) The Story of St. Mary's College, Cheltenham, p. 6.
 - 2 H. Barnes (ed.) (1891) Training Colleges for Schoolmistresses, p. 108.
 - 3 Cross Commission (1886) First Report, Minutes of Evidence, p. 461.

The founders of St. Hild's College, Durham, would have described themselves as Evangelicals, and the terms of Union with the National Society were not incorporated in the Trust Deeds of the college, though they were so incorporated in those of the neighbouring college for men.¹ The Principal of Chichester, giving her views about the introduction of a Conscience Clause, to the Cross Commission, said that her concern was not so much about denominational teaching as such but the possible threat to the family atmosphere of the college.² Yet by 1890 the influence of the National Society had become such that, without impinging in any way upon the independence of the individual Church of England colleges, it had become a unifying factor.

-
- 1 See M.V. Boyd (1977) 'Teacher Training at St. Hild's College, Durham, 1858-1910', unpublished thesis, p. 30.
 - 2 Cross Commission (1886) First Report, Minutes of Evidence, p. 496.

CHAPTER 2

THE ROLE OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY

The National Society, with a Standing Committee which included, ex officio, every diocesan Bishop, had as its aim the planting of a Church school in every parish in the land, and to that end fostered the growth of Diocesan Education Boards and Societies affiliated to it, together with District Committees and Organising Secretaries to be responsible for fund-raising. It could claim to be 'the parent and centre of the vast organisation of the Church of England for promoting elementary education'.¹

As we have seen, the Society was early in the field in providing its own colleges to train teachers for schools. But it also played a part in the foundation and growth of the diocesan colleges. By 1861 the Society had made grants, for building or extension, amounting to almost £6,000, to twenty diocesan colleges, ten of them in formal Union with the Society.²

1 National Society: Annual Report, 1889, p. 15.

2 H.J. Burgess (1958) Enterprise in Education, p. 122. The terms of Union with the Society state that an institution 'shall always be conducted upon the principles and furtherance of the ends and designs of the Incorporated National Society for promoting the education of the poor in the principles of the established Church'. Letter to Bede College, 29.8.1907, National Society, Bede Correspondence. The formal notice of Union was normally incorporated in the Trust Deeds of the college, as in the case of Bede, Carmarthen, Caernarvon, Exeter, Winchester, Derby, Lincoln, Norwich, Ripon and Truro. See Training College Commission (1916) Report, pp. 30-47.

Clearly the position of the Society was pivotal, a position it recognised in 1849. 'Neither the Committee nor the Society itself can claim to be considered as representing the Church of England, yet the interests of ... Church Education do depend in great measure on the ... faithfulness to its principles with which the Society arranges and maintains the relations between the Committee of Council on Education and itself'.¹

By 1878 the Society was prepared to make a fairly assertive statement about its position with regard to schools, claiming that it was in a position to act as the mouthpiece of the various Boards and as such had tried to secure 'that the National Society express the mind of the Church at large on education questions'.² It was to be some time before the Society saw itself in that position with regard to the colleges.

The attitude of the Society in the period before 1870 might almost be described as showing a reluctance to accept a responsibility which some colleges at least were happy that the Society should have. A request from the Derby Board of Education in 1854 that a meeting of Principals and Chaplains should be summoned by the Secretary, met with the reply that the Secretary had no authority to summon such a meeting without the consent of the college authorities.³ A similar response was made to a request from Culham fourteen years later, asking whether the Society would agree to summon a meeting if three Principals requested it.⁴

1 National Society: Annual Report, 1849, p. 51.

2 National Society: Annual Report, 1878, p. 14.

3 National Society General Committee: Minutes, 7.6.1854, p. 395.

4 National Society General Committee: Minutes, 5.2.1868, p. 363.

Nevertheless, when a major crisis arose, as over the Revised Code in 1862, the Society was prepared to call representatives of the colleges together. Several meetings were held, issuing in a Memorandum forwarded through the Inspectors to the Committee of Council.¹ The appeals from the colleges to the Society for financial help as a result of the Revised Code were not, however, made as to a central authority; the request was that a proportion of the funds received by the Society from the dioceses should be devoted to the diocesan colleges.² The appeals were successful as far as the men's colleges were concerned, and capitation grants, which came to be an important factor in college finances, were paid from 1864.

The Society had no sub-committee for dealing with the training colleges as a whole; decisions about giving help to colleges in exceptional difficulty in the 1860s were made by the General Committee and put into effect by the Finance Committee.³

The ending of State inspection and examination of Religious Knowledge in 1870, and the establishment of Board Schools operated under the Cowper-Temple clause, forced the Society to take a more active role in college work, and they were quick to take the view that the 'general efficiency of the training colleges, especially

1 National Society: Annual Report, 1863, p. vii.

2 St. Hild's College Management Committee: Minutes, 18.6.1863.

3 National Society General Committee: Minutes, 7.4.1869, p. 382.

with reference to their religious character, has become a matter of the very highest importance'.¹ The Society's interest was quickened because more than ever before, the teachers would be responsible for ensuring that 'a moral and reverent tone' was impressed upon the children.²

It was again a time of crisis, and again the Society agreed to call a meeting of Principals, to consider the future of inspection and examination of Religious Knowledge. It then acted as their spokesman in requesting the Archbishops in 1871 to make such arrangements as they thought desirable.³ This led to the involvement of the Society in two ways. There was a financial commitment to defraying the costs of the entrance examination and examination for students in residence, which by 1888 had reached £1,000 per annum, and to meeting the salary of the Inspector of Church Training Colleges appointed by the Archbishops to make a personal inspection.⁴ There was involvement also in nominating one of the three members of the original Examining Board in 1872 and two of the six members of the reconstituted Board in 1886,

1 National Society: Annual Report, 1871, p. 15.

2 National Society: Annual Report, 1879, p. 16.

3 National Society General Committee: Minutes, 13.1.1871, p. 434.

4 The Inspectors' Reports are included in the Annual Reports of the National Society from 1879. The appointment was held first by Canon J.P. Norris of Bristol, who had been an H.M.I. of Schools from 1849-1864. He was succeeded by Canon Darby of Chester in 1876 and then by the Chief Diocesan Inspector for London, Prebendary Reynolds, in 1895.

and in placing the Society's office and staff at the disposal of the Board for the administration of what the Society considered to be a vital enterprise in which it was properly concerned.¹

The Society had allied its financial involvement with colleges to its concern for religious teaching by making the capitation grants, payable to the men's colleges before 1870, payable from 1875 only to those, men and women, in the First or Second Class in the Religious Knowledge examination at entry.² This led to a number of complaints from colleges about provincial disadvantage in such an arrangement.³ The matter was resolved, first by extending the capitation to all men in 1878 and then, in 1881, in what was described as an 'experimental arrangement', by making a grant for all included in the Class List in religious subjects.⁴ Payments were still being made in 1890 and the colleges' dependence, and reliance, on the Society are demonstrated.⁵

-
- 1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 8, 5.12.1888, p. 393.
 - 2 National Society: Annual Reports, 1871, p. 14, and 1875, p. 18.
 - 3 'To colleges like ours, the loss of grant by the alteration will be considerable'. York Correspondence, National Society, 22.5.1875. A later letter from York, dated 14.1.1876, pleaded that they were 'obliged to take even those who have failed in the religious subjects examination'.
 - 4 National Society General Committee: Minutes, 2.2.1881, p. 435.
 - 5 It is clear, however, that the bulk of the income from sources other than grants was contributed by the students themselves in the form of entrance fees. See Board of Education: Report, 1900-01, p. 197.

The examination of religious teaching was clearly the priority of the Society in its relations with the colleges in this period. It was thus quite happy to allow the S.P.C.K. to follow through its initiative in seeking to provide additional places in the colleges after 1870. The Society did indicate its willingness to help if the S.P.C.K. was not able to grant all the applications for aid, but it could only help 'at the expense of other operations', referring no doubt to the commitments described above.¹ It was those 'other operations' which caused the Society to withdraw from the original promise of a substantial sum for the new college at Tottenham in 1878.

In all this activity on the part of the National Society, there is no indication that the Society was an authority, or regarded itself as having any authority over the colleges. But the fact that by 1879 expenditure on the colleges formed the largest item in the annual budget of the Society and that the Society then took the view that 'no branch of the National Society's work is ... more important than that which relates to the establishment and maintenance of Training Colleges'², made it inevitable that it would seek to play an active role. It is no surprise to find the Society acting as the spokesman of the Principals directly with the Education Department in 1879. At the request of St. Mark's, one of

1 S.P.C.K. Standing Committee: Minutes, 24.6.1872, p. 127.

2 National Society: Annual Report, 1879, p. 16.

its own colleges, it had sent a circular to all Principals about the continued employment of untrained teachers, and then on the basis of the replies made representations about the general concern.¹

There was, however, no question of central control or of acting without consultation. Even in the sphere in which it exercised direct influence through the Examining Board and capitation, the Religious Knowledge examinations, the Society did not control. It could express disquiet in 1888 about the admission of students who had not passed the Religious Knowledge examination, but it had no power of compulsion.²

Thus the supreme authority of the individual Governing Bodies remained intact in 1890. We see this clearly from the events following the inclusion in the Certificate syllabus for 1891 of works by Spencer and Bain. The National Society referred both to the Bishop of London for his examination, and then sent a letter to Principals expressing grave objection to such books being placed in the hands of young students. A deputation of Members of Parliament was despatched to the Education Department to persuade them to approve alternative authors.³ H.M.I. Mr. Fitch made a spirited defence of the need to make students aware of 'some of the

1 National Society General Committee: Minutes, 3.12.1879, p. 372.

2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 8, 1.2.1888, p. 358.

3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 9, 6.7.1892, p. 136.

speculations of the best writers on education' and was delighted that the Society's protest had been supported neither by Principals nor by lecturers. Only three of the women's colleges, including two Roman Catholic colleges, had decided to study the alternatives.¹

At least one college, however, thought that in the appointment of the first Archbishops' Inspector in 1871 matters had been taken out of the control of the Governors, and that consultation had not taken place. The Governors of Saltley objected and said they would accept no further appointment.² This may have an isolated case but it is significant that on the appointment of a successor in 1876 the Society felt it necessary to say that all the colleges connected with the Church of England were prepared to welcome his visits.³ However, the willingness of the Society in 1882 to take the interpretation of its role a stage further than in 1849⁴, in declaring 'the importance of the trust committed to the National Society as the organ of the Church in regard to Education and as representing the interests of more than 1,200 Elementary Schools',⁵ is perhaps an indication of what to expect in the future development of the Society's relationship with the colleges.

1 Committee of Council: Report, 1891-92, p. 476.

2 See C.S. Allatt (1970) 'The History of St. Peter's, Saltley, 1850-1900', unpublished dissertation, pp. 102-103.

3 National Society: Annual Report, 1876, p. 18.

4 See p. 8.

5 National Society: Annual Report, 1882, p. 7.

CHAPTER 3

ROMAN CATHOLIC COLLEGES AND ORGANISATION

In 1890 there were three Roman Catholic Colleges: St. Mary's Hammersmith, for men, Mount Pleasant in Liverpool, run by the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur, and a second college for women, in Wandsworth, under the Society of the Sacred Heart. Indeed, the continuing history of Catholic teacher-education is bound up with the work of religious communities.

Yet the initiative did not lie with the religious communities, but with the Catholic Hierarchy, working through the Catholic Poor School Committee which had been established by the Bishops in 1847, with one clerical and two lay members for each diocese, and whose claim to speak on behalf of all Catholic schools had been admitted by Government since that time.¹

The foundation of colleges was undertaken centrally by the School Committee. Thus the initiative in the establishment of St. Mary's in 1850 had been taken by Cardinal Wiseman with the Committee, and the initial step in the foundation of Mount Pleasant was taken by the Committee asking the Bishops in 1853 to indicate which religious community should be invited to open a college for women.² It was resolved in 1892 to have two Training College

1 The word Poor was dropped from the title in 1892.

2 D.A. Carrigan (1961) The Catholic Teachers' Colleges in the United Kingdom, 1850-1960, pp. 63 and 78.

Committees, one for Hammersmith and Wandsworth, and one for Liverpool.¹ The women's colleges were the property of the communities which ran and maintained them. The School Committee itself owned the Hammersmith property, but was responsible to the hierarchy and the Education Department for the efficiency and well-being of all three.² This is the heart of the matter. The hierarchy was the effective decision maker. The School Committee deliberated and passed resolutions. Then a deputation would wait upon the Bishops, who then handed down their decisions on the resolutions, to the Committee. This is the pattern of the Annual Meeting. Thus on a resolution from the Bishops the Catholic School Committee was restructured in 1897³, the Committee was unable to proceed with a new wing at Hammersmith in 1902 until the Bishops were reconciled to the cost⁴, and in 1904 the hierarchy replaced the Committee by the Catholic Education Council, to be the central body in close communication with the Board of Education. The appointment of a Secretary was left to the Executive Committee, consisting of thirty members, 'with the one distinct understanding that they were not to get a leader'.⁵ The Council was to remain the servant of the hierarchy.

1 Catholic School Committee: Report, 1892, p. 12.

2 Catholic School Committee: Report, 1895, p. vi.

3 Catholic School Committee: Report, 1897, p. 6.

4 Catholic School Committee: Report, 1902, p. 3.

5 Catholic School Committee: Report, 1904, p. 4.

Nevertheless, the central body did not oversee the day to day running of the colleges, and was therefore unable to prevent the financial irregularities at Hammersmith, uncovered on the death of the Principal in 1899. The Fathers of the Congregation of the Mission took over the college to remedy a situation in which the college had been living for years beyond its income.¹

It is this centralisation of decision making, however, which distinguishes Roman Catholic teacher-training from Anglican organisation at this time, for there was no corresponding authority. The Roman Catholic provision was perhaps a reflection of the priority which they gave to teacher-training, a priority which they were quicker to recognise than the Anglican authorities.

The two main functions of the Catholic School Committee, described in the statement of its Constitution, Aims and Objects were: to promote ecclesiastical Inspection of schools, and to secure the efficiency of Catholic Elementary schools by educating a sufficient number of trained teachers. 'Upon this supply depend the prosperity of Catholic schools, the efficiency of their teaching and their share in the public grant'.² Thus the Committee originally

1 Catholic School Committee: Report, 1899, p. 12. The original intention had been to have Hammersmith run by a religious community but this had not worked out, and so it became a secular college in 1854. See Cross Commission (1886) First Report, Minutes of Evidence, p. 330.

2 Catholic School Committee: Report, 1888, p. v.

made an annual grant to the colleges of that part of their expenses which was not covered by Government grants. In addition, special encouragement was given to candidates for St. Mary's College in recognition of the difficulty of recruiting male Roman Catholics, in the form of a refund in the course of the two years, of the entrance fee paid by students.¹

The expenditure on the training colleges was one of the first two charges laid upon the Committee by the Bishops. The income was derived from church collections, subscriptions and dividends, and by 1892 the expenditure on the training colleges had become a priority and was described as 'the first charge on the Committee'.² By 1895, awards of varying amount, depending on examination results, were paid to every pupil-teacher entering Hammersmith, and the grant to the women's colleges consisted of a per capita entrance fee and annual maintenance grant. At the same time, new science facilities were being provided for Hammersmith, and the college was described at the time as 'never finished from the first'.³ The provision of candidates rather than the adequacy of facilities was perhaps judged the greater priority.

Allied with this was the recognition by the Committee that the objects of providing inspection and a supply of teachers 'lie outside the ordinary provision of a diocese for its wants ... Those who support only local schools fulfil in consequence, but

1 Catholic School Committee: Report, 1888, p. vi.

2 Catholic School Committee: Report, 1892, p. 17.

3 Catholic School Committee: Report, 1895, p. 26.

half their obligation'.¹ This very important statement of principle highlights the difference between the Anglican position and that of the Roman Catholics at the end of the century. It was a principle slow to win acceptance in the Church of England, if indeed it can be said ever to have done so in the period under review.

The consequence for the Roman Catholic Church is that it is possible to discern a clear pattern in the development of provision in the twentieth century, with new colleges being located in, or in close proximity to, large cities and areas of substantial Roman Catholic population.² Individual Bishops may have been anxious to promote colleges in their own dioceses but the overall needs of the Church had to coincide with such a desire before it could come to fruition.

1 Catholic School Committee: Report, 1888, p. vii.

2 D. Carrigan (1961) The Catholic Teachers' Colleges in the United Kingdom, 1850-1960, p. 145.

CHAPTER 4

METHODIST COLLEGES AND ORGANISATION

Like the Roman Catholic Colleges, the two Methodist Colleges in existence in 1890, Westminster and Southlands, were the deliberate creation of the denominational community.

The Methodist Conference, the supreme Governing Body of the Methodist Church, with equal lay and clerical representation, set up in 1838 the Wesleyan Education Committee. This was to be a medium of communication on educational subjects, 'whether with the Government of the country or with other public bodies'.¹ From its inception it undertook the superintendence of the training of teachers, sending candidates, until 1851, to David Stow's Glasgow Academy. One of the objects of the Centenary Fund, established by the Conference in 1839, was the provision of a training college, but the first mention of a plan for such an institution, in London, was made in 1845. It was not however until 1851 that Westminster opened its doors, to both men and women candidates.²

The close connection between the Conference and its offspring was reinforced by the fact that all four Principals between 1851 and 1940 were ordained and became President of the Conference, and three of them held influential posts in the Education Committee.³

-
- 1 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1901-02, p. 1.
 - 2 H.F. Matthews (1949) Methodism and the Education of the People, p. 130.
 - 3 J. Scott 1851-1868, J.H. Rigg 1868-1903, H.B. Workman 1903-1930 and A.W. Harrison 1930-1940. See F.C. Pritchard (1951) The Story of Westminster College, 1851-1951.

The Education Committee was, of course, responsible to Conference, and it was Conference which took the decision in 1871, when applications were becoming too many for Westminster, to increase opportunities for training by transferring the women to a new and separate establishment. There was anxiety to save applicants from being 'compelled either to enter the Training Colleges of the Church of England and so become members of the Church, or to enter the Colleges of the British and Foreign School Society, where, in the midst of the temptations of the metropolis, they would be left without the important advantages of pastoral oversight and distinctively Wesleyan training'.¹

The new college was established at Battersea in 1872 and moved to Wimbledon in 1930. Like Westminster, it was from the first under the absolute control of the Wesleyan Education Committee, even in minor matters such as the appointment of servants. In 1904, however, the Board of Education refused to continue to recognise such an arrangement. Responsibility for the colleges was handed to a joint Governing Body, an arrangement which lasted until 1929, but the Education Committee retained the oversight of finance and

1 Minutes of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, 1871, quoted in E. Williams (1972) The History of Southlands College, 1872-1972, p. 7. This comment points to the recognition of the fact that the shortage of places in training colleges was such that candidates were prepared either to accept confirmation or indicate their willingness to seek it, in order to gain a place in one of the Church of England colleges. The Archbishops' Inspector reported in 1897 that one Principal of a men's college had received twenty-three letters from Nonconformists indicating their willingness to be confirmed. National Society: Annual Report, 1897, p. 77.

responsibility for building extension, the right of appointment of Principals and Chaplains and responsibility for religious teaching and worship.¹

In the same way as at Westminster, there was at Southlands a reinforcing of the connection with the Conference. The first four Principals were ordained, the first and second were Secretary of the Methodist Education Committee on appointment, and the third had previously been President of Conference.² In addition, the joint Governing Body for Southlands and Westminster had, until 1921, the President of Conference as Chairman. It was Conference which, in 1899, gave favourable consideration to a plan to build a third college, situated in the North, a development which had originally been suggested before the property at Battersea had been acquired. This idea was abandoned, however, with the prospect of the establishment of L.E.A. colleges after 1902.³ Instead, it was decided to extend Southlands at a cost of £10,000 which, it was hoped, would come from the Twentieth Century Fund which Conference launched in 1898 with a target of one million guineas. Westminster also looked to this fund to enable it to bring its equipment and

-
- 1 Methodist Education Committee: Report, 1939-40, 1940-41, pp. 19-20.
 - 2 G.W. Olver 1872-1881, G.O. Bate 1881-1886, F. Greeves 1886-1895 and J. Chapman 1895-1913. See E. Williams (1972) The History of Southlands College, 1872-1972.
 - 3 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1903-04, p. 31.

accommodation up to date, although at the time of the college's Jubilee in 1901 the Church had already contributed £62,000 to its maintenance.¹ £200,000 of the Fund was to be devoted to educational purposes, and in 1903 £30,000 was set aside for the colleges, to enlarge Southlands and to improve Westminster, 'to meet oft-repeated Government requirements'.²

What emerges clearly in the work of the Education Committee is the priority which comes to be given to teacher-training, and indeed to a greater degree than that given by the Roman Catholic authorities. In 1870 the Methodists had 743 schools, and in the wake of the 1870 Education Act the number reached a peak of 910 in 1873. Following the 1902 Education Act, however, there was a resolution of the Education Committee to the effect that no new Wesleyan School should be established 'in any place where the Local Education Authority undertakes to establish a Christian Unsectarian School worked under the provisions of the Cowper-Temple clause'.³

The policy by the end of the nineteenth century had become one in which it was sought to exercise an influence more through the guiding of the character of teachers than through the provision of bricks and mortar in the shape of additional schools which, it was felt, could be supplied more adequately by the State. It was a

-
- 1 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1901-02, p. 68.
 - 2 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1903-04, p. 31.
 - 3 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1902-03, p. 56.

Church policy concentrating on the training of men and women 'who will take into the schools that truly religious approach which it has ever been its object to provide'.¹

1 H.F. Matthews (1949) Methodism and the Education of the People, p. 199.

CHAPTER 5

THE UNDENOMINATIONAL COLLEGES

In 1890 there were eight institutions which regarded themselves as non-sectarian, that is, they were open to candidates of any religious persuasion, but could not in any sense be regarded as secular institutions.

Six of the colleges were in connection with the British and Foreign School Society, which had its origin in a Committee formed in 1808 to help extricate Joseph Lancaster from financial difficulties, and which became known in 1810 as 'The Institution for Promoting the British System for the Education of the Labouring and Manufacturing Classes of Society of every religious persuasion'.¹ Lancaster's supporters, both Nonconformists and those on the Evangelical wing of the Church of England, were firm in their conviction that religion could be imparted without dogmatic instruction.

The headquarters of the Society was in Borough Road in Southwark, where Joseph Lancaster began training courses for men in 1805 and, shortly afterwards, for women. The Female Department continued until 1868, when it transferred to Stockwell. In 1890 the Borough Road College had moved to Isleworth in Middlesex and was thus separated from the offices of the Society, which were

1 H.B. Binns (1908) A Century of Education, p. 64.

moved to Temple Chambers. In addition to the London colleges the Society took the initiative in the foundation of a college at Bangor, in 1858, but the enterprise was carried out by local supporters and thus the college was never under the management of the parent Society.

The Society played its part in the flurry of Voluntary activity after the 1870 Education Act, and new colleges for women were established at Darlington and in Swansea in 1872. Indeed, it was felt after 1870 that there should be a concentration on the training of teachers, since the School Boards were now in a position to do the kind of religious teaching in schools for which the Society had been founded.¹ The latest venture of the Society was the contribution to easing the shortage of places for women with the establishment of a college at Saffron Walden in 1884, for the training of 'Mistresses for infants' schools on Kindergarten Principles'.²

The colleges at Isleworth, Stockwell and Saffron Walden were directly under the control of the Council of the Society and were a charge on the Society's general funds. Saffron Walden and Stockwell had Committees appointed annually by Council, and the College Committee of Borough Road, established after the separation

1 Many British Schools passed into the care of School Boards after 1870, but on the other hand a large number of British Schools was opened in the two decades after 1870. See H.B. Binns, op. cit., p. 189.

2 H. Barnes (ed.) (1891) Training Colleges for Schoolmistresses, p. 162.

of the college from headquarters, was formally an advisory sub-committee of the Society, and its secretary was the Secretary of the Society.¹

The Secretary of the Society was a key figure in the exercise of control. The post was held from 1868 to 1907 by the Reverend A. Bourne, who throughout that period was General Superintendent of the three colleges. As such he exercised a general control and supervision, over and above the Principals, and acted as correspondent for the colleges with official bodies. In addition he was nominal Principal of Stockwell 1870-1892. Bartle describes him as 'the last major personification of the deep religious fervour which had guided the policy of the British and Foreign School Society since Lancaster's days',² and the interlocking spheres of his activity and responsibility made him a powerful figure. The central body was concerned with management details, whereas the National Society was not, even in the colleges it owned, once the management had been handed over to their own separate Councils.

1 G.F. Bartle (1976) A History of Borough Road College, p. 48. Not until after the Second World War did the links with the Society become looser, with the College Committee having direct access to the Ministry of Education and increased financial powers, and with a Bursar instead of the Society Secretary responsible for administrative work. See G.F. Bartle, op. cit., p. 85.

2 G.F. Bartle, op. cit., p. 39.

The two Welsh colleges were governed by their own Committees, elected by the local subscribers and responsible for both management and support. The Darlington Committee was representative of Society supporters in the six Northern counties, with the Treasurer and Secretary ex officio members. Ultimate control in financial matters, however, was retained by the Society, and the ruling was that voluntary contributions belonged to its general funds. The college as far as possible paid its own expenses but deficiencies in the accounts would be made good by the Society, though it had the right to set a limit. The local Committee was in control of day to day matters, but matters such as the provision of a new wing for Darlington in 1903 became the responsibility of the central body.¹

The two colleges not connected with the Society were Homerton and Edgehill. The former took its name from the district in North London in which it was located until 1894, when it moved to Cambridge. It was formed in 1852 out of two training schools established by the Congregational Board of Education, after Congregationalists had withdrawn their support from the British and Foreign School Society in protest against the acceptance of State support in 1845. It was not until 1869 that Homerton itself came under Inspection and accepted grant-aid. The college received Congregational financial backing but was firmly unsectarian. No membership of a denomination was required but the intention was to foster a religious spirit. The attitude of the college to religion

1 O.M. Stanton (1966) Our Present Opportunities, p. 90.

was based on a principle of 'greatest liberality and freedom' and 'no Conscience Clause is necessary'.¹

The one totally independent non-sectarian college was at Edgehill, Liverpool, founded in 1885, by 'zealous friends of the cause of education'.² The contributors were mostly from Liverpool, but there was no intention of giving the college a narrow or local character. There was no Religious Knowledge entrance examination but instruction was given on an undenominational basis. A knowledge of French, German or Latin was desirable at entry because, says Barnes, 'the object of the College is to produce a superior class of elementary schoolmistresses'.³

-
- 1 H. Barnes (ed.) (1891) Training Colleges for Schoolmistresses, p. 274.
 - 2 Committee of Council: Report, 1884-85, p. 435.
 - 3 H. Barnes (ed.) (1891) Training Colleges for Schoolmistresses, p. 107. The information on which Barnes bases his description of women's colleges in 1890 was largely supplied by the colleges themselves.

PART 2

CHALLENGE

1890-1914

SECTION 1

THE CHALLENGE OF THE
DAY TRAINING COLLEGES

CHAPTER 1

THE DAY TRAINING COLLEGES

The standard histories of English education regard the establishment of Day Training Colleges as one of the most important results of the Cross Commission's deliberations. Necessity was on the side of the signatories of the Minority Report, for with only eight undenominational training colleges in England and Wales there was a serious shortage of available places, and the evidence to the Cross Commission from the School Boards had stressed that any increase in college places should be undenominational in nature. The new civic universities saw teacher-training as a way of increasing numbers and prestige, and had indeed worked out a concerted plan before presenting their evidence to the Commission, and day training colleges 'had evidently become Departmental policy while the Commission was in session'.¹

By the end of the century there were sixteen such institutions in being, with just under twelve hundred students.² Historians of teacher-training have drawn attention to the major influences of this development, on both teacher-training and the universities. Lynch sees in this first involvement of the universities with teacher-training the beginning of 'the long haul of emancipating the colleges, their staff and pupils from their socially ambivalent

1 J. Tuck, in D.E. Lomax (ed.) (1973) The Education of Teachers in Britain, pp. 73-4.

2 Board of Education: Report, 1900-01, p. 190.

and intellectually despised tutelage'.¹ Rich highlights the promotion of research in education and the recognition that the systematic study of education is appropriate work for a university.² Located in the civic universities, with their scientific and technical base, the day training colleges encouraged a steady flow of science students into teaching³, and at the same time were a major factor in the development of Arts faculties, and thus, in the words of Armytage, 'saved the younger universities from remaining glorified technical colleges'.⁴

These could, however, all be described as long-term influences. The initial impact of the day training colleges lay in their breaking of the Voluntary monopoly, the establishment of a dual system in colleges as in schools, and the challenging of the much-vaunted residential idea of training. Thus it came about, says Rich, 'that the older colleges responded to the challenge of the day training colleges by increased activity and an expansion of outlook'.⁵

-
- 1 J. Lynch (1979) The Reform of Teacher Education in the United Kingdom, p. 8.
 - 2 R.W. Rich (1933) The Training of Teachers in England and Wales during the Nineteenth Century, p. 231.
 - 3 J.B. Thomas (1978) 'The Day Training College: A Victorian Innovation in Teacher Training', in British Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. IV, No. 3, p. 259.
 - 4 W.H.G. Armytage (1954) The Role of an Education Department in a Modern University, (Inaugural Lecture), Sheffield, 8.12.1954, p. 10.
 - 5 R.W. Rich (1933) The Training of Teachers in England and Wales during the Nineteenth Century, p. 230.

A number of changes did take place in colleges in the last decade of the nineteenth century, but it is not clear that all such changes can be directly attributed to the need to meet competition. Indeed there is little evidence of fear of competition, although the Roman Catholics prevented such a situation arising by taking a characteristically hard line. The Principal of Hammersmith, in evidence to the Cross Commission, had expressed the general Catholic view that though day colleges could teach as efficiently as residential colleges, the students in them would not be trained, in the sense of coming under formative influences essential to the training of a teacher.¹ Their concern was that Catholic teachers should be trained in Catholic institutions, and thus the Catholic Poor School Committee recommended the Bishops to take steps to prescribe employment of teachers trained in the Catholic colleges, while admitting that if day colleges were established which would 'give adequate securities for the attendance of Catholics without danger to their Faith and morals', a change of policy might be possible.²

The Wesleyan colleges felt they had nothing to fear, though some effect was felt. At Southlands, prior to the establishment of the day training colleges, the intake included a larger number of students from London than subsequently, but their places were taken

1 Cross Commission (1886) First Report, Minutes of Evidence, p. 453.

2 Catholic School Committee: Report, 1891, p. 3.

by more candidates from the North and other strong areas of Methodism. There was no threat to recruitment.¹

The evidence of those Church of England Principals called as witnesses before the Cross Commission had been uniformly opposed to the introduction of day training colleges. For the most part the Principals of the Home and Colonial Institution and St. Mark's, Chelsea, confined themselves to expressing confidence in the existing residential system, and pointing out the benefits which would be lost by students in an alternative system which could only be inferior.² Canon Daniel, Principal of Battersea, went further, however, and expressed the fear that many pupil-teachers would prefer a day system, which would thus pose a serious threat to the residential colleges.³

In the event, there is little evidence that the colleges found themselves in serious competition. Bede College, Durham, reported losing several men to Newcastle in 1891⁴, and the opening of the London Day Training College in 1902 brought a decrease in applicants to Tottenham.⁵ No other published

1 E. Williams (1972) The History of Southlands College, 1872-1972, p. 39.

2 Cross Commission (1886) First Report, Minutes of Evidence, pp. 466, 468.

3 Cross Commission (1886) First Report, Minutes of Evidence, p. 442.

4 Bede College: Annual Report, 1891, p. 8.

5 G. Handley (1978) The College of All Saints, 1878-1978, p. 11.

college history consulted makes a point of mentioning direct competition for candidates, and we know positively from an enquiry by the Salisbury Diocesan Board of Education in 1902 that the residential training colleges in Wales had not suffered from the establishment of the day training colleges at Cardiff, Aberystwyth and Bangor.¹

This is perhaps no more than one would expect in the light of the Inspectors' confident assurances in the matter. H.M.I. Mr. Oakeley, the Inspector of the men's colleges in 1890, did not see the day training colleges as a challenge to the Voluntary colleges, a challenge made necessary because of the defects of the latter. 'It is not generally known how good the lectures and the teaching are', was his view, and he asserted that they were in no need of additional stimulus from the rivalry of the day colleges.² Such a confident assertion may well have been made about the London colleges, but, as we shall see, it was not justified with regard to the residential colleges as a whole.

There was no immediate rush of candidates to the day training colleges, in spite of the lifting of the original restriction to two hundred places, in 1891. Of the 342 candidates who sat the Queen's Scholarship examination at Chelsea, Culham and Durham in 1890, only 25 wished to be admitted to a day training college³, and

1 National Society Correspondence: Enquiry dated 12.11.1902.

2 Committee of Council: Report, 1890-91, p. 419.

3 Committee of Council: Report, 1890-91, p. 428.

the London residential colleges continued to attract the best candidates. The average place on the Queen's Scholarship list of those admitted in 1891 to Battersea was 170, to Borough Road 108, to Chelsea 257, and to Westminster 351. At Hammersmith the average position was 464, the low position reflecting the poor social and educational background of male Roman Catholic candidates. By contrast, the average place at the Durham Day Training College was 884, lower than that of any of the residential colleges for men, Exeter excepted. Mr. Oakeley declared, 'so far, at any rate, the university colleges have obtained by no means the best of the pupil-teachers'.¹

A similar situation is found in the following year when only 125 male candidates expressed a wish to enter a day training college, only nine of whom were in the first hundred on the Class List.² In the following year 22 out of the first hundred sought entry.³

Outside London the day training colleges provided a stronger attraction to good candidates. At Cambridge in 1894 the average position on the Scholarship List at entry was 56, and both Manchester and Liverpool attracted a better quality of candidate than those in London.⁴ Yet the situation as viewed by Mr. Oakeley was that 'most

1 Committee of Council: Report, 1891-92, pp. 444, 456.

2 Committee of Council: Report, 1892-93, p. 18.

3 Committee of Council: Report, 1893-94, p. 116.

4 J.B. Thomas (1978) 'The Day Training College', in British Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. IV, No. 3, p. 257.

of these colleges continue to have to fill up their numbers by drawing on the still considerable surplus supply of the residential colleges'.¹ By 1896, however, one-fifth of those on the list of First Class Queen's Scholars expressed a wish to enter a day training college.²

H.M.I. Mr. Fitch, the Inspector of the women's colleges, was perhaps prepared to go further than his Inspectorial colleague. He agreed that the women's colleges had no need to dread competition, but it is significant that he was thinking primarily in terms of the social, domestic and religious advantages of the residential colleges. He was prepared to admit, however, that 'some of them need freshening and invigorating on the purely educational side of their work'.³ But there was no occasion for a frenzy of activity or change, and the early criticisms of the work of the day training colleges would not have gone unnoticed.

The theory of the day training colleges was admirable, marking a step towards bringing Elementary education into organic coherence with the intellectual life of the country, but the beginning of the practice was not without severe difficulty. The later successful image of the day training colleges and the contribution they made to the study of education and the development

1 Committee of Council: Report, 1893-94, p. 116.

2 Committee of Council: Report, 1896-97, p. 214.

3 Committee of Council: Report, 1891-92, p. 475.

of the modern university should not encourage us to see the end of the process in the beginning.

The day training college was no place for the weaker candidate. Mr. Oakeley in 1893 admitted that 'some who stand low on the list and know no Latin whatever, profit but little by lectures which must be over their heads'.¹ His comment in the following year, that disappointment had been expressed by some Principals that the Queen's Scholars could not take their places in the ordinary classes immediately but required some help before they could do so, is equally revealing.² His last report on the day training colleges was no more encouraging. 'The student ... is unhappily often ill prepared to undertake with any facility the University course ... he leaves with a degree ... but with very little idea of what a degree is supposed to betoken'.³

In 1903 the academic examination papers of those non-degree students in day training colleges were, for the first time, looked over by the examiners of the residential colleges and, even allowing for the perhaps natural bias of the scrutineers, a disturbing situation was revealed. 'The Board ascertained in this way for the first time how extremely inadequate were the arrangements made in many of the Day Colleges, for securing full, accurate and equitable tests of their students' work and for arriving at a proper basis of

1 Committee of Council: Report, 1893-94, p. 140.

2 Committee of Council: Report, 1894-95, p. 137.

3 Committee of Council: Report, 1898-99, p. 321.

comparison with work done by students in residential colleges'.¹ At the same time, concern was expressed over the small number of students in day training colleges who had taken any bona fide university examination at the end of their training. In 1902 a total of 1,235 students had been exempted from the Board's examination in academic subjects, but only 220 men and 290 women had passed any examination, 'the standard of which, taken as a whole, was definable and guaranteed by a University'.²

The concurrent degree and professional work in the day training colleges was a strain even for the best candidates, and the tendency was for the professional side of the work to suffer. H.M.I. Mr. Scott Coward warned against such a devaluing of the professional, reminding the colleges that the aim was to bring Elementary schools under the influence of teachers of superior culture, 'and not to produce teachers who deem these schools below their dignity'.³ By the time of his last report, Mr. Oakeley felt that little headway had been made in providing adequate supervision of teaching practice. The day training colleges, with their small professional staffs, could not provide sufficient help and guidance in the area most needed.⁴

The intention, of course, was to provide such help. At the Durham College it had to be understood by the candidates that their

1 Board of Education: Report, 1902-03, p. 52.

2 Ibid.

3 Committee of Council: Report, 1895-96, pp. 173-4.

4 Committee of Council: Report, 1898-99, pp. 318-9.

technical work took precedence¹, and the insistence was no less strong at the London Day Training College where candidates, all of whom were admitted to read for degrees, were warned that 'the purely professional subjects will not be treated as of secondary importance'.² But where both elements of the course were taken equally seriously, the demands made upon the students were such that the process of qualifying 'was a severe and unremitting struggle'.³

An additional factor which would not have worked in the best interests of recruiting to the day training colleges was that travelling and living conditions, together with the demands of the work, made for little contact with other students, thus destroying one of the advantages claimed for the new system by its proponents. Tyson draws attention to the prejudice against the early pupil-teachers felt by many of the other students at Newcastle⁴ and it is revealing that the authorities in the university colleges felt that there was little that they could do to promote friendly relationships between the new class of students and others.⁵ Hence the reiterated encouragement by the

-
- 1 J.C. Tyson and J.P. Tuck (1971) The Origins and Development of the Training of Teachers in the University of Newcastle upon Tyne, p. 26.
 - 2 London County Council Day Training College, pamphlet, March 1903, p. 5.
 - 3 R.F. Goodings, 'The London Day Training College', Education Libraries Bulletin, No. 4, 1959, p. 28.
 - 4 J.C. Tyson, op. cit., p. 30.
 - 5 Committee of Council: Report, 1894-95, p. 137.

Inspectors of the provision of residential accommodation, which led to the decision that after 1910 a condition of recognition would be the availability of hostels for women students.¹

Goodings indicates that the students' lack of financial resources often precluded their participation in the social activities of the college and the university², and there is a regretful note in the tone of Mr. Oakeley's last report in 1899: 'the advantage derived by the students of a day training department from their connexion with a local University College should be more than a share in the privilege of attending lectures of eminent teachers whom they do not always understand'.³

Thus there are grounds for thinking that we should not exaggerate the immediate impact which the day training colleges had upon the older system.

-
- 1 Elspeth Huxley, in Love Among the Daughters (1968) describes the 'pecking order' among students at Reading where, in the 1920s, the two-year education students were ranked lowest on the list: "Edu's' tended to cluster together looking earnest, pallid (probably from malnutrition) ... and if girls, to live in some remote hall ... that no-one else ever visited'. p. 49.
 - 2 R.F. Goodings, 'The London Day Training College', Education Libraries Bulletin, No. 4, 1959, p. 26.
 - 3 Committee of Council: Report, 1898-99, p. 325.

CHAPTER 2

ACADEMIC WORK AND RECRUITMENT OF STAFF

There were changes in the residential colleges at the end of the nineteenth century, in academic work, in the improvement of facilities and in the liberalising of attitudes. But the changes were not uniform in extent and some colleges remained unchanged in one, or two, or in all three areas. The existence of the day training colleges was a factor in bringing about such changes but there were other factors making for change.

In the academic sphere the best colleges carried further the kind of developments with which they were already involved. They were already moving towards the taking of university examinations. The Report of the Cross Commission showed that while among the women's colleges there had been no students passing Matriculation in the previous three years, it was a different picture in the colleges for men. Here, all except York reported students who had matriculated, though only Battersea and Westminster distinguished clearly between those who had matriculated while in residence and those who had been successful after leaving college. In addition, Battersea, Borough Road, Chelsea, Chester, Saltley and Westminster reported residential or past students who had taken Intermediate or Final university examinations, though again only Battersea and Westminster made clear that some had done so while in residence. The London colleges especially, were clearly encouraging their students in this direction, Battersea with 26 who

had matriculated, ten while in residence, and one graduate, Borough Road with 15 who had matriculated and 7 who had taken the Intermediate London examination. Chelsea had 23 graduates and 21 who had matriculated, and Westminster 14 graduates and 24 who had matriculated, 18 of them while in residence. In addition, Whitelands was able to report three students who had gone on to take university examinations.¹

We must not forget also, however, that a number of women's colleges had been widening their students' horizons through involvement in the University Extension movement. Mr. Fitch commented on the increasing number of colleges so involved in 1890 and noted with satisfaction that the students at Oxford and Durham had received lectures from university staff.²

The movement towards advanced work was of course speeded up by the provision of a third year's training for selected candidates under the 1890 Code, and the extension to the residential colleges

1 Cross Commission (1888) Training College Returns, pp. 1-224. Question 10 on p. 1 asked: How many students have during their residence in the last three years, or who have left college during the last three years, subsequently
1. Matriculated, 2. Graduated?

2 Committee of Council: Report, 1890-91, pp. 455, 482. Cambridge organised the first University Extension lecture centres in 1873 at Derby, Leicester and Nottingham. Their 'missionaries of higher education' reached Newcastle in 1879, and in 1887 Newcastle was affiliated to Cambridge as an Extension centre. London formed its Extension Society in 1876 and Oxford in 1878. See R.S. Watson (1897) The History of the Literary and Philosophical Society, Newcastle upon Tyne.

in 1891 of the privilege granted to the day training colleges of exemption from the Board's examinations. The syllabus was divided into Part I: technical subjects, and Part II: academic subjects, and students passing university examinations 'will not be required to present themselves for examination in those portions of Part II of the syllabus which were included in that university examination'.¹ Thus was facilitated the entry of larger numbers of students into degree work, who did not have to cope with two examination syllabuses at once.

The London colleges took immediate advantage and three of the men's colleges proposed to enter all their students for university examinations.² By 1896 the two colleges in Durham were entering students for degrees, and the concession granted to Bede students in 1892 whereby two years spent at the college were permitted to count as three terms residence in the university, was extended to the women students.³ From 1897, Darlington enjoyed the same arrangement, with third-year students taking up residence in Durham itself.⁴

1 Committee of Council: Report, 1890-91, p. 421.

2 Committee of Council: Report, 1891-92, p. 438.

3 St. Hild's College: Annual Report, 1896, p. 4.

4 O.M. Stanton (1966) Our Present Opportunities, p. 82.

At Mount Pleasant in 1893 several of the first-year students were preparing for London Matriculation¹, and in the following year, sparing 'no expense or trouble to place the college in the front rank of educational progress'², students were being sent to the university college in Liverpool for lectures in Education and Science. Returns received from 33 residential colleges in 1900 showed candidates taking London, Manchester and Durham examinations, with Battersea, Borough Road, Chelsea and Stockwell more successful in getting candidates through them than any four day training colleges.³

In fairness to the day training colleges, however, it must be said that Mr. Oakeley was equally harsh about residential college students doing degree work. He thought that only the exceptional few could really benefit from university education. He found not only the exceptional few, however, but also 'those striving to read Sophocles, perhaps, while struggling with the Greek verbs'.⁴

In the decade after 1890 it would be more accurate to describe the competition from the day training colleges as potential rather than actual, in terms of recruitment of students. In the matter of improvement of staff, however, there is little doubt that the

1 Catholic School Committee: Report, 1893, p. 13.

2 Committee of Council: Report, 1894-95, p. 183.

3 Board of Education: Report, 1900-01, p. 194.

4 Committee of Council: Report, 1898-99, p. 321.

Inspectors used this potential threat to urge the colleges to look to their laurels. The case of the women's colleges was more urgent than that of the men's, which already in 1890 were, generally speaking, adequately staffed. Of the 106 staff in the men's residential colleges, 62 were graduates, and of the eighteen establishments inspected, twelve had more than 50% of graduate staff. The situation in the female establishments was quite different. Twelve colleges had only graduate clerical Principals, four had only graduate Chaplains and Truro and Warrington each had two graduate clergy on the staff. Darlington had two lay graduates and the Home and Colonial Institution, one. Three colleges of the British and Foreign School Society, together with Edgehill and the two Roman Catholic colleges, had no graduate staff.¹

By 1898, however, the Inspector was able to express satisfaction with the increasing number of staff with university degrees. There had been a definite break in the closed circuit of training of staff for the women's colleges, whereby students had been appointed direct from college or after a brief experience of teaching. Women had been appointed who had been educated in Secondary schools and with Secondary training, and even where former students had been appointed they had generally had a third year's training.²

-
- 1 Committee of Council: Report, 1890-91, pp. 432-448, 478-493. Mount Pleasant, Liverpool, staffed by nuns of wide cultural background and experience in schools, was exempt from strictures about staffing in this period. 'This college is in the front rank and satisfies all the requirements of the most advanced idea of education'. H.M.I. Scott Coward, in Catholic School Committee: Report, 1894, p. 19.
 - 2 Committee of Council: Report, 1898-99, p. 321.

There were thus grounds for optimism that staffs would be able to cope with the new situation, not simply to take the university classes and third-year students, but to teach the increasing numbers coming in who had attended pupil-teacher centres and who had thereby received what might be described as a form of Secondary education, and also to teach the better material which began to come into the colleges from 1899 when admission was opened to those passing university, university local or equivalent examinations.¹

Where the day training colleges did make a direct contribution to the need for better staffs in the residential colleges was in the production and dissemination of material which increased the intellectual demands on both students and lecturers in the colleges. Much of the reading matter for the courses had to be written by the day training college staff themselves, and this then became available for wider consumption.²

1 Board of Education: Report, 1900-01, p. 194.

2 J.B. Thomas (1978) 'The Day Training College', in British Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. IV, No. 3, p. 259.

CHAPTER 3

THE UNDENOMINATIONAL CHALLENGE

Of more pressing concern perhaps to the Church of England colleges than competition from the day training colleges in the post-1890 period, was that from undenominational residential institutions. The latter were proving to be more attractive to the best of the Queen's Scholars. In 1893 only 14 of the first hundred women on the Scholarship List entered Church colleges. Stockwell, Edgehill and Darlington had more First Class applicants than places, and both Swansea and Saffron Walden had filled with First Class students. On the other hand, Whitelands, Tottenham and the Home and Colonial Institution had not received sufficient First Class applicants to fill available places. The irony of the situation lay in the fact that 30% of those in the undenominational colleges were Church of England adherents.

The reasons for this state of affairs, Mr. Fitch believed, were the compulsory Religious Knowledge entrance examination, and the time devoted to religious instruction in the Anglican colleges, time which of course counted for nothing as far as the award of the teaching Certificate was concerned. Mr. Fitch was also concerned about the questioning of candidates about their religious intentions, 'respecting which, even the most serious minded and thoughtful young people at the age of eighteen sometimes feel it premature to make any pledges or professions'.¹ He urged the

1 Committee of Council: Report, 1893-94, p. 160.

Church of England authorities to retain what was of value but at the same time not to give students cause to think that they were at any disadvantage as compared with students in other colleges. As an illustration of the unreasonable expectation that he had in mind he notes the enforced attendance of students at Salisbury at mattins in the Cathedral every day, in spite of the considerable loss of study time this entailed. As an illustration of the prevalent attitude he criticises College Committees whose major concern in the appointment of a Principal was theological rather than educational and who, having made the appointment, 'have left him to discover for himself what a training college was like and what it had to do'.¹

It is clear that this question of Religious Knowledge requirement was a particularly sensitive one for the Church of England colleges in the period after 1890, heightened by the lack of such requirements in both the day training colleges and the undenominational residential establishments. The Association of Principals of Church of England Training Colleges held its first meeting at the offices of the National Society in 1892, and resolved to hold an Annual Meeting to discuss secular and religious matters. It is significant, however, that all the meetings held before 1901 were concerned almost exclusively with the Religious Knowledge examinations. The Minutes reflect continuing disquiet, especially on the part of the men's colleges. It was recommended

1 Committee of Council: Report, 1893-94, pp. 160-161.

in 1894 that Confirmation should be held to be a sufficient guarantee of elementary religious knowledge in the case of candidates for entrance, and two years later it was urged that diocesan examinations in the last year of pupil-teachership should be accepted in lieu of the entrance examination, commonly known as the National Society's examination. In the same year there was an unsuccessful attempt to have all the Religious Knowledge examinations abolished, and a motion from Bede College in 1900, 'deprecating the present system of Religious Instruction' was no more successful. There was clearly no unanimity among the colleges, even among the Society's own colleges. St. Mark's was in favour of acceptance of Confirmation, Battersea was for a diocesan examination and Whitelands was in favour of neither, wishing the entrance examination to remain.¹

The attempt to bring about change reflected the unease, both about the demands which the subject made on the candidate's time, which were affecting recruitment, and also about the wider issue of examining a subject which, fundamentally, was concerned with developing in students attitudes and aspirations which could not be examined.² The Archbishops' Inspector in 1894 revealed a further cause of unease, that 'such study involved no intellectual exercise', and made public the colleges' fears that the

1 National Society Correspondence: Memoranda dated 30.4.1894, 4.4.1894, undated 1894.

2 Council of Principals of Church of England Training Colleges: Minutes, 1892-1900.

examinations interfered with 'the growth of spiritual apprehension of Divine Truth'.¹

The National Society did not exhibit the same sensitivity as the colleges. It instituted an enquiry in 1893 into the reasons why students had been admitted without passing the entrance examination.² To the Principal of St. Mark's assurance that acceptance of Confirmation would guarantee a religious knowledge 'little if at all inferior to that provided by the present entrance examination', the Society's comment was, 'How then is this examination now a hindrance?'³ A meeting of Bishops at Lambeth in 1894 adopted a different approach and as a result of their representations the Examining Board agreed to make the examination simpler.⁴

A similar sensitivity to the question of religious knowledge was displayed by the Roman Catholic colleges in this period, and again because recruitment was affected. The Catholic School Committee resolved in 1893 to ask the Bishops to make it a condition of entry to every training college that a Certificate

1 National Society: Annual Report, 1894, p. 24.

2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 9, 3.5.1893, p. 175.

3 National Society Correspondence: Memorandum dated 30.4.1894.

4 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 9, 6.6.1894, p. 230. The Society had its way, however, in agreeing to the changes only on condition that only those attempting the optional Prayer Book papers could be awarded a First Class pass. See National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 9, 18.7.1894, p. 245.

of efficiency in religious knowledge be obtained from a diocesan Inspector of Schools.¹ This rule then appeared in the Aims and Objects at the beginning of each Annual Report of the Committee, but was widely ignored, and especially at Hammersmith, in the anxiety to secure candidates. The question arose again in 1898 when the colleges were asked to consider the advisability of a rule to prevent pupil-teachers from Board schools entering the colleges. It had been recognised by some on the Committee that in some cases there was no alternative training in Catholic schools available. Both Hammersmith and Mount Pleasant felt that it was undesirable to have a hard and fast line. Mount Pleasant preferred that they should agree to 'admit no candidate not desirable from a Catholic point of view', and Wandsworth, though in favour of a test before entry, wanted a less severe one.² The matter was referred to the Bishops but there is no mention of a ruling. The religious knowledge requirement remained and, presumably, continued to be ignored.

1 Catholic School Committee: Report, 1893, p. 2.

2 Catholic School Committee: Report, 1899, p. 9.

CHAPTER 4

COLLEGE LIFE

It is a commonly held view, expressed by Dent, that one of the effects of the establishment of the day training colleges was that the residential colleges were 'stimulated (or scared) into improving their accommodation ... and humanising their regimes'.¹ But there were other factors at work.

Students would indeed have been aware of the greater freedoms of the day training colleges, though it is a mistake to think that women in the latter were not carefully shepherded, hence the concern for the establishment of hostels², but students entering college at the end of the century would also have had higher expectations than their earlier counterparts, both as regards facilities in the colleges and about the way in which they should be treated. The activities of the National Union of Elementary Teachers since 1870³, in working to enlarge the conception of what was required of a teacher, would have made many students, and

-
- 1 H.C. Dent (1975) The Training of Teachers in England and Wales, 1800-1975, p. 33.
 - 2 Miss Bannister, Principal of the L.C.C. Moorfields Training College was to comment in 1910 on the need for residence as 'the only way of giving the necessary training in habits of cleanliness, courtesy and general self-discipline'. ED 24/486 Memorandum by Miss Bannister on well-being of students in Day Training Colleges. Memo. dated 4.7.1910. Public Record Office.
 - 3 The word Elementary was dropped from the title in 1889.

particularly the men, less inclined to accept those restraints on students which would have been seen as designed to give young people a humble view of their future role and to check undue ambition.¹

Not all colleges responded in the way that Dent suggests, nor was the level of response the same in each institution which did so. H.M.I. Mr. Scott Coward perceptively commented that one of the defects of the training colleges was that 'they depend for their improvement structurally and otherwise, on the accident of possessing energetic committees and principals'.² Where these were not to be found, the evil consequence was virtual stagnation. Truro had a non-resident Principal, who was at the same time suffragan Bishop of the diocese, from 1873-1917. A new Vice-Principal in 1903 found everywhere 'drab and dreary beyond description',³ while a new Principal at Culham in 1890 'promised much but achieved little', apart from the encouragement of football, and eventually resigned in 1898 in a dispute with the Committee.⁴

1 P.H.J.H. Gosden (1972) The Evolution of a Profession, p. 4.

2 Committee of Council: Report, 1896-97, p. 216.

3 M.G. Brown (1938) Training in Truro, 1813-1938, p. 25.

4 L. Naylor (1953) Culham 1853-1953, p. 83.
See W. Etherington (1969) 'A History of St. John's College, York, 1841-1914', unpublished thesis, for details of the conflict between Principal and Committee which prevented any action being taken on the Inspector's strong complaints between 1892 and 1896 about facilities and professional training, until the Principal resigned in 1898.
See also D.S. Elmes (1969) 'The Voluntary Colleges with Special Reference to Fishponds Diocesan College', unpublished thesis, for Inspectorial criticism which led to three almost complete changes of staff, including Principals, between 1889 and 1895.

There was, however, increasing acceptance that recreation rooms, science laboratories and other work rooms were not luxuries but necessities, and that libraries, museums, i.e. resource centres and other facilities to enhance the quality of the training and of residential living in general, were in accord with the needs of a trained teacher at the end of the century. But the provision even of a common room was not without its critics. At Hockerill College not all subscribers approved of the expense and thought that 'students should work, not amuse themselves'.¹ At St. Hild's, Durham, the students were grateful for such provision, which relieved them of taking their rest on the seats of the classrooms, sitting back to back for ease and comfort.² At Lincoln the Inspector suggested the provision of a common room in 1897, for the fourteenth time, but to no avail, and by 1899 it was the only women's training college without such a facility.³ Neither Culham nor Westminster had a common room at the end of the century.⁴

What held the colleges back from improving facilities was almost invariably a chronic shortage of money. The old enthusiasm which had surged in the period of the founding of the colleges, and again after 1870 to meet the need for more teachers, no longer

1 G.A. Wood (1938) History of Hockerill Training College, p. 45.

2 St. Hild's College Magazine, 1923-24, p. 2.

3 D.H.J. Zebedee (1962) Lincoln Training College, 1862-1962, p. 69.

4 Board of Education: Report, 1900-01, pp. 204, 207.

existed. The financial picture in 1900 from this point of view was indeed a melancholy one. It was reported that out of a total Voluntary college income of just over one quarter of a million pounds, only just under sixteen thousand pounds represented income from the contributions of charitable bodies and diocesan boards.¹ Most of the colleges, however, did make some effort to improve buildings which had for the most part been erected in the middle of the century.

Norwich moved to a new site and new buildings in 1892 at a cost of £13,000, raised chiefly by local effort², and Wandsworth doubled its accommodation at this time.³ In 1895 the S.P.C.K. purchased the freehold of Battersea and in 1899 agreed to provide £8,500 for enlargement if the National Society would pay 3½% interest on the outlay.⁴ Whitelands, not wishing to be ordered to make improvements, as Lincoln and Ripon had been ordered, borrowed £2,000 in 1896 and, with National Society approval, a further £4,000 in 1899.⁵ By the end of the century, Salisbury, Chichester

-
- 1 Board of Education: Report, 1900-01, p. 197.
 - 2 National Society, Norwich Correspondence: Brochure, 1892.
 - 3 Committee of Council: Report, 1892-93, p. 152.
 - 4 National Society, Battersea Correspondence: letter from S.P.C.K. dated 4.1.1899.
 - 5 National Society, Whitelands Correspondence: letter to Principal, 19.7.1899.

and Cheltenham had been considerably enlarged.¹ But, as a later enquiry was to point out, in the absence of any generally recognised standard in judging buildings and equipment of training colleges, the suggestions of Inspectors were sometimes made with insufficient knowledge.² Thus the colleges in general continued on that 'trail of cheapness' which McNair was later to say had characterised their development.³

In the matter of changing attitudes and liberalising of regimes, there was some relaxation, but always within a rigid framework. The Principal of Homerton might claim as early as 1891 that the students were 'masters and mistresses of their own time, going out as they like and when they like in the afternoon', but the Inspector remained unimpressed that matters were not arranged to enable the men and women students to work together.⁴ A similar situation existed at Cheltenham where, although the women were admitted to the science classes in the men's establishment, they were met at the main entrance by the lecturer, escorted to the cloakroom and then to the classroom, where the men remained standing until the women were seated. At the end of the session

-
- 1 Board of Education: Report, 1899-1900, p. 335.
 - 2 Training College Commission (1916) Report, p. 8.
 - 3 Board of Education (1944) Teachers and Youth Leaders, p. 13.
 - 4 Committee of Council: Reports, 1891-92, p. 503, 1894-95, p. 195.

they were escorted out in the same way.¹ Not until 1936 did the authorities cease to frown on the association of the sexes, when dances were permitted.²

There were disciplinary troubles at Chester in 1901 and the Principal reported that behind them lay the students' knowledge of different conditions in the day training colleges and the liberty allowed there.³ This was not an isolated incident.

The Archbishops' Inspector of Church Training Colleges drew attention in 1901 to frequent cases of insubordination in the men's colleges which he put down to the preponderance of Board School pupil-teachers.⁴ The men's colleges were clearly having difficulty in securing the acquiescence of the students in the fulfilling of two of the three functions of a Church college as defined by the Archbishops' Inspector, that is, distinctly spiritual work, the imparting of religious knowledge, and secular work for the Certificate examination. The Inspector's surprise at finding 'how seldom correct belief is considered as a duty' and at being 'told point blank' by many students 'that they have a perfect right to do what they pleased with their own minds'

-
- 1 E.B. Challinor (1978) The Story of St. Mary's College, Cheltenham, p. 30.
 - 2 W.E. Beck (1947) A History of the Cheltenham Training Colleges: St. Paul and St. Mary, p. 21.
 - 3 J.L. Bradbury (1975) Chester College, 1839-1975, p. 178.
 - 4 Report of the Archbishops' Inspector, in National Society: Annual Report, 1901, p. 102.

gives some idea of the limits of any liberalising process which took place in the Church colleges.¹

There is a hint too that all was not well at the Roman Catholic college for men at Hammersmith, in the observation by the Catholic School Committee in 1895 that there were some 'who might be more suitably occupied in another calling than that of Catholic teacher'.² In 1900 twenty-two men were temporarily rusticated from Culham for breaking college rules, and the episode is described as 'the last serious effort at insubordination'.³ At Westminster also, after the retirement of J.H. Rigg, Principal from 1868-1903 and described by Pritchard as the 'symbol of the dogmatic strength of nineteenth-century Methodism', his successor encountered disciplinary problems as the rules were not sufficiently relaxed.⁴

The bonds of control remained very tight. At Winchester as elsewhere the day was strictly regulated and evening work supervised, but as late as 1902 a man's absence to go to the library or elsewhere had to be noted in a book.⁵ At Bede in this

-
- 1 Report of the Archbishops' Inspector, in National Society: Annual Report, 1898, p. 72.
 - 2 Catholic School Committee: Report, 1895, p. 16.
 - 3 L. Naylor (1953) Culham 1853-1953, p. 88.
 - 4 F.C. Pritchard (1951) The Story of Westminster College, 1851-1951, pp. 114 and 107.
 - 5 E.B. Shipley (ed.) (1962-7) The History of King Alfred's, Winchester; typescript, p. 36.

period work, sport, recreation and leisure were all closely integrated and organised to the hilt to create a 'balance of effortful living'.¹ At Saltley and at other men's colleges the centre of social life was the Volunteer company, somewhat misnamed as willingness to join was assumed and any objector had to give publicly a reason for his objection. Church and State marched hand in hand in compulsion, and discipline was rigid and authoritarian.²

In the case of the women's colleges there is no evidence of insubordination and students were clearly more compliant. Such changes as did take place may have seemed drastic, but in terms of relaxing control they amounted to very little. The general lightening of timetables in the 1890s left the students with some freedom, but to organise themselves into Societies for the purpose of widening their intellectual horizons. But these were not unsupervised pursuits and Williams comments in relation to the arrangements at Southlands that 'the determination to occupy usefully the majority of the young women's time was common to colleges at this period, but the ideals of Methodism reinforced

1 D.E. Webster (1973) Bede College, p. 15.

2 J. Osborne (ed.) (1950) Saltley College Centenary, 1850-1950. pp. 112, 121.
See F.W.T. Fuller (1971) 'The History of St. Luke's College, Exeter 1839-1970', unpublished thesis, for the account of the reign of Dr. Dangar as Principal from 1869-1906, a reign which was clearly an autocratic if not despotic exercise of authority. His decisions appear arbitrary and there was no appeal.

this teaching'.¹ Yet at Ripon we do not hear of encouragement of even this limited approach to individualism until after 1909, in spite of having a Principal from 1892 described as a radical and 'with a conviction that students should enjoy their training'.²

Individualism even in the choice of a place of worship was not permitted in some colleges. At Durham, attendance only at churches in sympathy with the Evangelical views of the founders was permitted.³ Truro college students as a rule attended St. Paul's church but attendance at the Cathedral on Sunday morning was the permitted reward for doing well in a special Arithmetic test every fortnight.⁴

The conception in the colleges of the teacher as the clergyman's assistant remained strong⁵, and it was the declared policy of the Principal of Derby in office between 1898 and 1927 to prepare some students at least to help in Sunday Schools and in other ways in the parishes to which they would go.⁶ Little

1 E. Williams (1972) The History of Southlands, 1872-1972, p. 38.

2 A.M. Wilkinson (1963) Ripon Training College, 1862-1962, pp. 36, 60.

3 St. Hild's College: Minutes, 23.2.1893, 2.12.1907.

4 M.G. Brown (1938) Training in Truro, 1813-1938, p. 31.

5 See B. Sacks (1961) The Religious Issue in the State Schools of England and Wales, 1902-1914, p. 30.

6 M. Dobson (1951) The First Hundred Years of the Diocesan Training College, Derby, p. 32.

wonder that the British and Foreign School Society in its Annual Report in 1903 declared that the Church of England colleges 'remained hotbeds of ecclesiasticism'.

Control extended to the minutest detail. The crocodile walk was abandoned at Derby in 1893 and all domestic work abolished in the dining room and pantry five years later, but the freedom granted in 1897 to have flowers under the brim of one's hat did not extend to display on top.¹ At Hockerill, student involvement in domestic work did not end until 1923.² McNair some twenty years later was to make the point that there were still colleges where the amount of control and interference with the students' private lives constituted a discipline which was 'obsolete and wholly unsuited to young people from the age of eighteen to twenty-two'.³

And it was not only students whose activities were carefully controlled. It was not unusual into the early twentieth century for staffs in the older residential colleges to have to get leave from the Principal before going out.⁴ In 1913 at Winchester a tutor was refused permission to go out of residence, and thereby to marry.⁵ H.M.I. Mr. Oakeley in 1896 expressed himself satisfied

1 M. Dobson (1951) The First Hundred Years of the Diocesan Training College, Derby, pp. 19, 37.

2 G.A. Wood (1938) History of Hockerill Training College, p. 80.

3 Board of Education (1944) Teachers and Youth Leaders, p. 76.

4 L. Grier (1937) The Life of Winifred Mercier, p. 91.

5 E.B. Shipley (ed.) (1962-67) The History of King Alfred's, Winchester, 1840-1940, p. 53.

that 'self-respect, courtesy, manly and womanly bearing are more conspicuous than formerly', and gave as the reason the greater freedom allowed and trust accorded by the college authorities, treating the students 'not as schoolchildren, not as drudges, but as ladies and gentlemen'.¹ In the light of the evidence this would seem to be a sweeping generalisation.

And yet in spite of everything, the 1890s saw the foundation of many of the Old Student Associations, which have played such a full part in the lives of the respective colleges. The words of F.H. Spencer, in describing Borough Road, where he was a student in the 1890s, as 'a fellowship which binds its members into a solidarity',² would have been echoed in the Church colleges. It was the kind of solidarity which found expression in almost entire colleges marching out of the college gates to war in 1914, in the intense loyalty to colleges in the battles over Concentration and closure in the 1930s and annihilation in the 1970s. The Annual Reunion at St. Hild's College, Durham, until recent years, of the students of the 1907-9 age group is but a ripple in the wave of emotional energy which has rolled onwards in support of institutions to which generations of students have manifested an intense devotion.

1 Committee of Council: Report, 1896-97, p. 203.

2 F.H. Spencer (1938) An Inspector's Testament, p. 122.

CHAPTER 5

THE NATIONAL SOCIETY AND A COLLEGE INITIATIVE

The last decade of the nineteenth century sees the first attempt to set up some form of machinery to enable the Church of England colleges to take concerted action, at other than Principal level, on questions which arose affecting their interests. It was an attempt perhaps prompted by the coming into being of the day training colleges.

The initiative was taken by Lincoln Diocesan College in a letter to all colleges at the end of 1895, but not to the National Society itself.¹ The course of events which followed is significant both for showing the grounds on which the National Society, at least in the person of the Secretary, J.S. Brownrigg, opposed such a venture as unnecessary, and also for showing the reaction of one college at least, though probably more, to the National Society's interpretation of its role. The events are significant also as illustrating the power of the Secretary, which we will again see in later periods, in determining the policy and attitudes of the Society.²

1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter from the Hon. Sec., Lincoln Diocesan College, to Secretaries of Training Colleges, 27.12.1895.

2 Rev. J.S. Brownrigg was the National Society's Organising Secretary for the Southern District before becoming Secretary in 1891, an office held until 1906. Crockford's Clerical Directory, 1910.

A further letter was sent by Lincoln at the beginning of the following year, explaining the reasons for the initiative. It pointed out that the existing Associations were of staff and not of Governing Bodies, except indirectly through the Principals.¹ What was needed was consultation between those who had the responsibility for managing the colleges.²

It took roughly a year for the consultative machinery to take shape. A meeting at the Charing Cross Hotel in November, not at the National Society's offices, agreed to set up a Standing Committee of representatives of Governing Bodies, with one representative from each college and with the Dean of Lincoln as Chairman, to meet annually. Colleges were informed in December 1896 that eighteen representatives had already been nominated.³ The Secretary of S.P.C.K. replied to the effect that while he would place the matter before the Committee of Tottenham, the interests of the training colleges were already being watched over by the National Society.⁴ The reaction of Lincoln was to agree that the

-
- 1 In addition to the Association of Church of England College Principals which had been formed in 1892, the Training College Association, open to anyone on the teaching staff of a training college recognised by the Board of Education, had been founded in 1891. J.D. Browne (1979) Teachers of Teachers, p. 1.
 - 2 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter from Lincoln to training colleges, 4.1.1896.
 - 3 Ibid., letter from Lincoln to training colleges, 4.12.1896.
 - 4 Ibid., unsigned note to this effect, dated 7.12.1896.

Society did watch over the training colleges, as part of its concern for Elementary education, but to point out that it was not specially in touch with Governing Bodies and afforded no means of inter-communication or of concerted action. The Society had not considered as unnecessary the Association of Principals, which it had itself sanctioned and permitted to meet at the Society's offices. Communication between Governors, it was thought, was equally, if not more, necessary.¹

The National Society Secretary replied immediately to say that it did provide an opportunity for members of Governing Bodies to consult, at the Annual Meeting immediately following the General Meeting of the Society. 'I venture further to think that you are not justified in deducing from the meeting of Principals, that the National Society does not consider your proposed Committee unnecessary'.² A further letter afforded the information that the meeting referred to was open to anyone engaged in the work of the colleges.³

Lincoln, with some justice, pointed out that a meeting with so ill-defined an attendance hardly afforded a means of concerted action, and that from letters received 'it is plainly not regarded by any college as doing so'. No member of the Lincoln Committee

-
- 1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter from Lincoln to the Secretary of S.P.C.K. with a copy to the National Society, dated 12.12.1896.
 - 2 Ibid., letter from J.S. Brownrigg, to the Hon. Sec., Lincoln Diocesan College, 14.12.1896.
 - 3 Ibid., letter dated 17.12.1896.

had ever been invited or knew that attendance was possible. If the value and purpose of the meeting were as alleged, why, asked Lincoln, had there been no mention of this meeting before a Central Committee had been established?¹ In reply, the Secretary of the National Society, perhaps realising that matters had gone further than he thought they would, admitted that the Lincoln proposals had never been referred to the Standing Committee or discussed at any Committee. Adopting a new line of argument, and misreading the intention of the proposed Association, he said that he thought it would be a mistake for the Church colleges to do anything to separate themselves from the general educational work of the Church, over which the National Society considered itself to have oversight. And in a postscript, implying that what had been said in earlier correspondence had been said in a purely personal capacity, the Secretary asked Lincoln 'not to assume or allow others to assume that the National Society has ever offered any opposition to your scheme'.²

Lincoln's outraged reply pointed out that as all letters had been sent to the Secretaries of Training Colleges, and therefore to Brownrigg as Secretary of Battersea, 'the movement was or should have been known to you all along, and might have been brought before your Standing Committee'. The idea that the intention was to

1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter from Lincoln to J.S. Brownrigg, 19.12.1896.

2 Ibid., letter from J.S. Brownrigg to Lincoln, 21.12.1896.

separate the colleges from the general educational work of the Church was dismissed out of hand.¹

There the correspondence ends, and there is no indication elsewhere that the matter was ever placed before any Committee of the National Society, though it does seem likely that there was some involvement beyond the person of the Secretary. From a letter written by Brownrigg to the Principal of Whitelands in 1897 we learn that all three of the Society's colleges in London had declined to join the Association. The Secretary was protesting against the proposed reconsideration of the matter by the Council of Whitelands at a meeting at which the National Society representatives would not be able to be present.² Three other letters of the same date were written by the Secretary to clerical members of the Council, urging them to go to the meeting and protest. The tone of the letters suggests that the Secretary was not speaking in a personal capacity. 'The Association is got up by a man at Lincoln who has been giving us so much trouble ... it is certainly not wanted and will probably be mischievous'.³

The Society was clearly unwilling to encourage an organisation concerned with training colleges which it had not initiated and over which it had no control. We hear nothing further of the

-
- 1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter from Lincoln to Brownrigg, 28.12.1896.
 - 2 National Society, Whitelands Correspondence: letter from J.S. Brownrigg to J.P. Faunthorpe, 24.4.1897.
 - 3 Ibid., letter from J.S. Brownrigg to Prebendary B. Compton, 24.4.1897.

Association's activities.¹ The non-participation of the Society's colleges would have been a discouraging factor to others, and the known views of the Secretary may well have influenced the level of continued participation by the eighteen colleges which we know did nominate representatives at Lincoln's original invitation.

It was to take a crisis greater than the problems encountered by the colleges in the 1890s, including the emergence of the day training colleges, to bring the weight of the National Society behind the organisation of united action on the part of the colleges.

1 Even D.H.J. Zebedee (1962) Lincoln Training College, 1862-1962, makes no mention of the Association or Lincoln's initiative in connection with it.

SECTION II

THE LOCAL AUTHORITY CHALLENGE

CHAPTER 1

THE LOCAL AUTHORITY COLLEGES

The day training colleges may be regarded as the thin end of the wedge, of which the thick end was constituted by the local authority colleges. This development after 1904, with the recognition of a new type of training college not in connection with a university or university college, and which need not be residential¹, was to cause the Church colleges considerable anxiety, an anxiety not generally displayed in the course of the establishment of the early day training colleges. The new development, together with the continuing growth of the day training colleges, which numbered twenty by 1914, presented a formidable challenge.

It is true that the number of local authorities who took early advantage of the situation was few, and by 1914 there were only twenty local authority colleges among the one hundred and forty-six authorities for higher education. But in terms of facilities provided, especially after the original building grant of 25% had been increased to 75% in 1906, the Church colleges could barely compete.² And in terms also of providing additional undenominational places, the fear was that the new colleges would prove too great an attraction. In 1903 there were 7,056 teacher-

1 Board of Education: Report, 1903-04, p. 18.

2 Board of Education: Report, 1906-07, p. 47.

training places, 3,070 of which were without denominational restriction. By 1909 places had increased to 11,948 and unrestricted places to 7,118.¹ Denominational places between 1908 and 1911 remained almost stationary at about 4,900, while in the same period undenominational places increased by 700.² By 1913, the number of places available for candidates irrespective of their religious faith was 10,657.³

As a measure of the anxiety felt by the Church of England colleges, we have only to look at the response of the Principals. Having met at least once a year as an Association, to discuss almost exclusively the Religious Knowledge examinations, it was resolved at the December meeting in 1901, on the eve of the 1902 Education Act, that a Council of Principals should be formed to discuss questions of policy affecting the welfare of colleges.⁴ The Constitution was approved in the following year and the Objects set out. The Council was

'To watch over the interests of the Church colleges.

To discuss questions relating thereto and provide means for taking united action.

To serve as a medium of communication with the Archbishops' Examining Board in all matters relating to instruction and examination in Religious Knowledge'.⁵

1 Board of Education: Report, 1908-09, p. 60.

2 Board of Education: Report, 1910-11, p. 128.

3 Board of Education: Report, 1912-13, p. 6.

4 Council of Principals of Church of England Training Colleges: Minutes, 18.12.1901.

5 Council of Principals: Minutes, 20.12.1902.

The underlying anxiety is clearly revealed in the expression of hope emanating from a special meeting called to discuss the Education Act in the same year, hope that the competition in Elementary education, which the Council felt would disappear under the Bill, would not reappear in the training colleges, and the forlorn hope that if the new colleges were to be free or largely assisted by rate-aid, the existing colleges, depending heavily on student fees, would not be put at a disadvantage. The Council asked the Board of Education to accept the principle recognised in the provision of Secondary schools, that a school must not compete unduly with a neighbouring school, and openly expressed the fear that if competition were to be permitted, then the continued existence of the Church colleges would be endangered.¹

The Roman Catholic authorities, by contrast, welcomed the 1902 Act which, it was considered, would give immense impetus to training and the demand for places. And indeed they were right. In the following years there was a flurry of activity. A college was opened at Salford by the Faithful Companions of Jesus in 1903, and another in 1904 at Southampton by the Sisters of the Sacred Heart. In the same year Wandsworth moved to North Kensington. Two other foundations quickly followed, at Hull in 1905 by the Sisters of Mercy, and at Newcastle in 1906 by the Sacred Heart Sisters. These, like all the Catholic institutions founded in this period, were colleges for women. This stage of expansion was

1 Council of Principals: Minutes, 24.10.1902.

completed in 1910 with the opening of Selly Park, Birmingham, by the Sisters of Charity of St. Paul, for the training of its own nuns.¹

The idea was never entertained, however, that local authority colleges, any more than day training colleges or other undenominational institutions, would be likely to attract Roman Catholic candidates or provide an element of competition. There was clearly a recognition of different spheres of recruitment behind the assurance of the college at Southampton in 1905 that 'the relations of the college with the Education Authorities of Southampton are of the happiest kind'.² Indeed the Secondary education sub-committee of the Catholic Education Council, reporting in 1905, went so far as to recommend that in localities out of reach of Catholic Secondary schools and pupil-teacher centres, Catholics should be discouraged from seeking to enter the teaching profession.³ The passing of examinations and the receipt of a professional training were not enough. What was essential was to be educated as a certain kind of person, and that education could not be provided outside the influence of the Faith.

Predictably perhaps, the Wesleyan Education Committee saw Local Education Authority colleges not in terms of competition but

1 Catholic School Committee: Reports, 1903-04;
Catholic Education Council: Reports, 1905-10.

2 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1905, p. 49.

3 Ibid., p. 32.

as complementing their work. As early as 1891 the British and Foreign School Society had congratulated the Methodists on throwing their weighty influence on the side of unsectarian religious teaching in schools under public management¹, and, as we have seen, it was resolved in 1902 that no new Wesleyan school would be set up in any place where the local authority undertook to establish a Christian unsectarian school worked under the provisions of the Cowper-Temple clause.² In the same spirit the decision was made not to proceed with plans for a third college, to be sited in the North, because local authorities would be in a position to make provision for teacher-training. At the same time, however, the view was taken that as long as denominational schools formed part of the national system, Methodist day schools and colleges should be maintained 'in full vigour'.³

It was the Church of England colleges which felt the pressure and were stirred to take action. At the inaugural meeting of the Council of Principals it had been decided that copies of resolutions should be submitted to members of the National Society Standing Committee, and in forwarding the resolutions after the special meeting in 1902, the Chairman, the Principal of Battersea, pledged the Council's co-operation with the Society 'for the highest interest of the work entrusted to our charge', work described as

1 British and Foreign School Society: Report, 1891, p. 8.

2 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1902-03, p. 56.

3 British and Foreign School Society: Report, 1891, p. 9.

being 'for Church and State'.¹ As colleges of the Established Church they had a role to play in enabling that Church to fulfil its obligations to all, a role threatened by local authority colleges.

1 Council of Principals: Minutes, 24.10.1902.

CHAPTER 2

THE REACTION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND COLLEGES

The Principals, in the period after 1902, continued to voice concern at their meetings, forwarding their resolutions to the National Society and calling on them to take action. The General Council of the Church Training Colleges, which came into being in 1908, also turned its attention to the matter after the crisis which had brought it into being had passed.¹

The debate was marked by intense suspicion of local authority actions and of the intentions of the Board of Education. The over-reaction of the Archbishops' Inspector in 1911, railing against the 'reckless building of Training Colleges by local authorities with unlimited funds' intending to destroy the Church colleges, is typical of the passion engendered.² The passion is also seen in suspicion of the National Union of Teachers, whose influence was felt to be so hostile to Church colleges that Principals were advised by a National Society sub-committee not to allow Union officials to talk to their students.³

1 See Part 2, Section III.

2 National Society: Annual Report, 1911, p. 123.

3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 10, 22.1.1906, p. 408. This kind of reaction seems a little unbalanced in the light of the known views of the General Secretary of the Union, Sir J.H. Yoxall who, while agreeing that the Nonconformists had their grievances, felt that the chief factor in the training college problem was not denominationalism but the overall lack of provision, which the State should remedy. See ED 24/72, 'The Training College Problem', Article by Sir J.H. Yoxall, 1901. Public Record Office. Such a view is not surprising from one who was an old student of Westminster Training College. Between 1870 and 1951 the college provided three General Secretaries and sixteen Presidents of the Union from among its old students. F.C. Pritchard (1951) The Story of Westminster College, 1851-1951, p. 66.

The Council of Principals attempted to bring about control of the expected tide by calling on the Board of Education in 1904 to prevent the establishment of more colleges than were needed, either generally or in particular localities.¹ The failure of such a policy to emerge led the Principals in the following year to urge the National Society to hold a conference between those interested in the training colleges and the local authorities, in the hope of arriving at some arrangement agreeable to both.² The Society apparently did not follow this up but did accept an invitation from the County Councils Association to send representatives to a conference in 1906, the tone of which, according to one of the Society's representatives, 'was distinctly against the Church'.³

The fear that local authorities would intervene to prevent students choosing for themselves the college at which they wished to train was voiced by the Council of Principals in 1904⁴, a fear no doubt given expression because of the recent actions of the British and Foreign School Society. This Society had sent a Circular to local authorities offering to reserve places at one of its six colleges for nominees of any particular authority, together with representation on the college Councils if required, in exchange for 'a proportionate grant in aid of the extra buildings required, and an annual subsidy for the students' maintenance'.⁵

1 Council of Principals: Minutes, 13.1.1904.

2 Council of Principals: Minutes, 4.11.1905.

3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 10, 30.5.1906, p. 483.

4 Council of Principals: Minutes, 13.1.1904.

5 National Society Correspondence: letter from H.W. Chell, Bury L.E.A., 5.8.1903.

This fear, together with the suspicion that local authorities brought pressure to bear on Managers to appoint candidates trained in their own colleges when it came to employment, was to grow in the following years. The fear was such that the National Society agreed to questions being put to candidates in the London County Council elections in 1910, and to candidates in Municipal elections in 1912 and 1913, about their attitude to such discrimination.¹ The Society also urged the election to Local Education Authorities of as many supporters of Church education as possible, and sought to keep its finger on the pulse of events by endeavouring to secure a correspondent on each local authority. That much of the suspicion was without foundation is shown by the replies to a Society Circular in 1912, in which there was very little welcome from the dioceses for the idea of such correspondents. Winchester Diocesan Board of Education in fact refused to suggest names of possible correspondents, as it was anxious not to jeopardise the 'most friendly' relations with the different Local Education Authorities within its area. The clerical Secretary of the Gloucester Diocesan Association felt that, in the matter of election of sympathisers to local authorities, it would be unwise to stir up controversy when he was himself Chairman of the sub-committee of the Local Education Authority dealing with the training of teachers.² From Brighton, too, there

1 National Society Correspondence: Circular to Press, 24.2.1910, and National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 12, 4.12.1912, p. 92.

2 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: Summary of Answers to Circular 18.12.1912, pp. 1 and 21.

would have been little enthusiasm in 1912, for there was successful co-operation with the East Sussex County Council, which had established a hostel in connection with the college. The County Council was financially responsible for the hostel, but the college had equal representation on the joint Board of Management.¹

The impression that much of the suspicion was groundless was confirmed by the findings of a committee appointed by the General Council of Church Training Colleges in 1913 to investigate discriminatory practices. Its report referred to the preferences 'alleged' to be exercised by local authorities, a toning down no doubt made necessary in view of the findings. Only eight authorities, Cheshire, Croydon, Portsmouth, Bootle, Hull, Surrey, Kent and Hereford, were shown to confine aid to students attending non-Church colleges in their areas, but the reason for this was the need to fill expensive buildings and there was no obvious intention of acting to the detriment of denominational colleges. In the view of the Council the situation was one which needed watching but there was not sufficient evidence of discrimination to justify an appeal to national opinion.²

These findings, that most authorities were thought to be acting fairly, should have calmed the atmosphere somewhat. But isolated incidents such as that reported by the Archbishops' Inspector in the following year, of an authority which had compelled students

1 National Society, Brighton Correspondence: letter from G. Corfield, Principal, 19.1.1914.

2 General Council of Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 1.7.1913.

who had, months before, been accepted at a Church college, to cancel and go elsewhere, must have confirmed the suspicions of those who still felt that matters were more serious than generally supposed.¹

If fears about discriminatory practices by local authorities were in general allayed, fears about the competition posed by the new colleges were not. The Board of Education admitted that the new colleges were for the most part without the stimulus of university work, and suffered from some narrowness of outlook in drawing from their immediate localities.² However, the series of measures enacted by Morant between 1902-10, which had the effect of making it more difficult for residential college students to take concurrent degree and certificate courses, removed some of the former advantage of the Church colleges and intensified the competition.³ The effect of the measures was to reduce the number

1 National Society: Annual Report, 1913, p. 112.

2 Board of Education: Report, 1906-07, p. 61.

3 The 1904 Regulations made it very clear that the purpose of a Training College was 'the training of teachers for service in Public Elementary Schools'. Board of Education (1904) Regulations for the Training of Teachers, p. vii. The King's Scholarship was replaced by the Preliminary Examination for the Certificate in 1907 and college students were required to have passes with distinction in seven subjects, including two languages, before being permitted to enter on a degree course. Board of Education: Report, 1904-05, p. 38. The Board was, however, willing to accept a pass in one of the matriculation examinations as evidence of fitness to proceed to a degree course, but from 1910 no examination certificate was accepted as qualifying for entry to such a course unless it showed that the candidate had passed with a higher standard than a bare pass in English Language and Literature, and English History. Passes were also required in a language, together with Geography and Mathematics and either a second language or a Science. Board of Education: Report, 1909-10, p. 107.

of candidates taking degree courses, but the colleges continued to present candidates.

The Church colleges were determined to compete and to survive.

CHAPTER 3

THE COLLEGES' RESPONSE

In the face of such competition, physical provision assumed priority. The first line of action lay in continuing the move to improve buildings and facilities begun in the 1890s. A Memorandum from the Council of St. Mark's College in 1904, drawing attention to parts of the college which 'fall below acceptable standards of efficiency', led to a prompt decision by the National Society that it was prepared to raise the money to improve the accommodation.¹ The fund-raising took the form of a national appeal for £25,000 in order to maintain the college in the front rank, and at the same time S.P.C.K. undertook to assist in the improvement of Battersea.² In 1904 also, the Home and Colonial College removed from its site in Gray's Inn Road to Wood Green, having been threatened by the Education Department in 1899 with withdrawal of recognition if more suitable premises were not obtained within three years. The National Society made a grant of £100 towards the new buildings, recognising that such a grant, to a college accepting other than Church of England candidates, was being made in exceptional circumstances.³ In the same year, 1904, enlargement and improvement

1 National Society, St. Mark's Correspondence: Memorandum, 2.5.1904, and reply, 20.7.1904.

2 National Society: Annual Report, 1905, p. 17.

3 National Society, Home and Colonial Correspondence: letter to D.J. Thomas, Principal, 27.3.1901.

at eleven colleges was reported.¹ York alone among the men's colleges was included in the list but improvements at Chester and Saltley were reported in 1912, together with further work at Carmarthen and St. Hild's. By 1916 the colleges which had undertaken improvements included Cheltenham, Exeter, Chichester, Derby, Ripon and Truro, and twelve colleges in all were in debt for sums ranging from a mere £300 at Truro to £20,620 for Wood Green.²

There was, however, one Church college casualty in this period. The Oxford Training College, faced with making necessary improvements which would drastically reduce the already small number of students, 38, for which it could provide accommodation, invited the National Society's views. The Assistant Secretary, Mr. R. Holland, who was later to play a dominant role in the development of the National Society's relationship with the colleges, visited the college in 1911 and on the basis of his report the Society resolved that it could not recommend to the Governors that they should undertake further expenditure. This advice was followed, in spite of the objections of the Archbishops' Inspector that to give up such a college, and at Oxford, 'would indeed give the enemy occasion to blaspheme'.³ The National Society had fewer qualms about the closure, perhaps because of the continuing existence of Culham in the diocese, but the Archbishops' Inspector's

1 Brighton, Bristol, Carmarthen, Hockerill, Lincoln, Norwich, Salisbury, St. Hild's, Tottenham, Warrington and York. National Society: Annual Report, 1904, p. 89.

2 Training College Commission (1916) Report, pp. 3-4.

3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 11, 7.2.1912, p. 483.

comment that few in the diocese knew of the existence of the college about to be closed, is a significant indication of the level of diocesan involvement.¹

The second line of action was the opening of hostels to enable the colleges to take additional students, under a Conscience Clause. The Majority Report of the Cross Commission had accepted the Inspectors' view that the proposal of a Conscience Clause in the residential colleges would be a breach of faith by the State.² But the matter had not ended there, for the strongly expressed view of the Minority Report, that the dangers of a Conscience Clause had been over-emphasised, ensured that the question remained one of debate.³ The Standing Committee of the National Society had given an assurance in 1898 that it would in no way relax its opposition to such a proposal⁴, but when the new Church of England college, St. Gabriel's, Kennington, had opened in 1899, it had been permitted to do so only if it were worked with a Conscience Clause for day students. Thus it was opened for 180 students, but with classroom accommodation double that provided for residence.⁵

-
- 1 National Society, Oxford Felstead House Correspondence: letter dated 31.1.1912.
 - 2 Cross Commission (1888) Final Report, Part III, Ch. 6, p. 96.
 - 3 Cross Commission (1888) Final Report, p. 242.
 - 4 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 9, 7.12.1898, p. 464.
 - 5 Board of Education: Report, 1899-1900, p. 335.

The initiative in providing hostels came from the colleges themselves, the Principals agreeing to consider the advisability of such provision, in 1901.¹ There was, however, a protest from York against such 'ill-omened liberty',² though the College provided a hostel in 1903, and it was a policy of which the National Society Secretary did not personally approve.³ St. Hild's purchased a house for the purpose in 1903⁴, was closely followed in making provision by Ripon⁵, and the initiative was commended by the Archbishops' Inspector as likely 'to strengthen rather than weaken the work'.⁶ St. Hild's College might declare that its intention was 'to show that they did not wish to hinder the advancement in learning of those who might differ from them in religious belief',⁷ but there can be little doubt that the move was part of a policy designed to show that the establishment of local authority colleges was unnecessary.

-
- 1 Council of Principals: Minutes, 18.12.1901.
 - 2 National Society, York Correspondence: letter dated 23.6.1903.
 - 3 National Society, Norwich Correspondence: letter dated 25.4.1904.
 - 4 St. Hild's College: Annual Report, 1903, p. 21.
 - 5 A.M. Wilkinson (1963) Ripon Training College, 1862-1962, p. 46.
 - 6 National Society: Annual Report, 1903, p. 99.
 - 7 St. Hild's College: Annual Report, 1903, p. 21.

In a statement adopted at a meeting of Principals of the residential colleges in 1905, Governing Bodies were urged to express a readiness to discuss the question of the admission of day students, without denominational restriction.¹ The statement was an attempt to show that on the evidence of applications received for entry in 1905 there was no basis for the popularly supposed view that there was a shortage of places in training colleges, and that such additional provision of hostels as could be made by the residential colleges, and admission of day students, would avoid unnecessary waste and competition.²

The Principals of the Church of England colleges gave their support to the proposal to admit day students without denominational restriction, by the necessary two-thirds majority.³ It was then forwarded to the National Society and accepted by the Standing Committee in 1906. By this time, Salisbury had joined the ranks of those making provision for Nonconformists, and the encouragement of the general establishment of open hostels then became National Society policy⁴, together with admission of day students under a Conscience Clause.⁵

-
- 1 The meeting was held at Westminster College and one may safely assume that the Methodist Principals were present. It is unlikely that such a statement would have received the support of the Catholic Principals.
 - 2 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: Report of a Sub-Committee appointed by Principals of the Residential Colleges, 24.6.1905.
 - 3 Council of Principals: Minutes, 4.11.1905.
 - 4 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 10, 7.3.1906, p. 439.
 - 5 Ibid., 22.1.1906, p. 408.

There were, however, elements in the Society at the time which took a particularly pessimistic view of the future of the Church colleges, and not only on account of the increasing competition. In a report not made public, fear was expressed of increasing intervention by the Board of Education which might lead to the imposition of conditions which the Church could not accept. The feeling was also strong that there would shortly be an attempt to introduce some form of popular control into the management of colleges. In the light of the conclusion 'that the old order of things is passing away and that the future lies with those who have power to grasp the new situation', it was recommended that the Society should devote part of its resources to the establishment of hostels in connection with day training colleges in London, rather than think in terms of sinking still further capital in the building of colleges.¹ The outcome was the opening in 1908 of St. Michael's Hostel at Grove Park, for Church of England women candidates in connection with Goldsmiths' college, which had been handed over by the Livery Company to London University in 1905 and which had a teacher-training department. This was a new departure for the Society, in an attempt to extend Church influence in teacher-training.

1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 10, 22.1.1906, p. 408, Report of the Sub-Committee on Training Colleges.

CHAPTER 4

RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

The third line of action taken by the colleges in the face of competition was to continue to voice unease about the Religious Knowledge examinations for students in residence and for entrance, an unease which the National Society did not share and did not understand.

The Society's view was one that the colleges could not ignore, although every college Committee had the right to make up its own mind about what it would or would not accept. However, the setting up and organisation of the examinations had been with the approval of the Archbishops, which appeared to impose an obligation on the colleges to accept. In that organisation, the Society played a prominent part, both in the administration of the examinations through its office, and with its representatives alongside those of the Archbishops and Principals on the Examining Board. In addition, the Society had emphasised its support for the examinations by linking the payment of capitation fees, an important source of income to the colleges, with performance in the examinations.

In 1901 the Principals had asked for the withdrawal of the system of payment by results, which they considered to be 'harmful to the best interest of the religious life and work' of the colleges.¹

1 Council of Principals: Minutes, 18.12.1901.

The response had been a change in the basis of payment by the Society, but prompted by its inability to provide for the increasing number of students. It was decided to fix a maximum amount payable to each college, to be reduced by £2 for every male student and £1 for every female either not presented for, or failing the Religious Knowledge examinations. The difference in the sum reduced was a reflection of the Society's anxiety about the poor results and attitude to Religious Knowledge in the colleges for men.¹

The Archbishops' Inspector agreed with the Principals that the influence of the Religious Knowledge examinations did not always help the purpose of his visit, which was primarily seen in terms of finding out the 'tone and character' of the work and of the students, and of encouraging the devotional side of college life.² But as a member of the Examining Board he would also have been in agreement with the Society's resolution in 1904 that in order to retain the confidence of Managers of Church schools, 'it is essential that a general examination under the authority of the two Archbishops should be maintained up to its present standard'.³ That resolution could almost be taken as the reply to the concern of the Principals which led them to call a special meeting in October 1904, the outcome of which was a request forwarded to the

1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 10, 5.2.1901, p. 98.

2 National Society: Annual Report, 1903, p. 95.

3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 10, 7.12.1904, p. 293.

Archbishops, the National Society and the Examining Board, urging an enquiry into the whole system of religious instruction and examination.¹

Colleges at this time were spending an average of three hours forty minutes per week on the subject, though the period spent ranged from two and a quarter hours to five and a half hours.² The resentment this aroused, especially in the men's colleges, may be judged from the case of a student at St. Mark's who wrote particularly displeasing papers in 1905. The Principal described the result as 'an excellent example of the terrible result of the National Society system of compulsory examinations in Religious Knowledge', which had led to student hatred of the Church responsible for such a system.³ The letter not surprisingly brought the rebuke from the Society that it was hardly consistent with the writer's position as Principal of St. Mark's.⁴ The Principal, R. Hudson, remained a consistent opponent of the examination and his letter is remarkable for the depth of feeling that it showed, even in one of the Society's own colleges.

The insensitivity of the Society's reply was matched by that shown in the questions to which Principals were asked to submit

1 Council of Principals: Minutes, 28.10.1904.

2 National Society: Annual Report, 1904, p. 89.

3 National Society, St. Mark's Correspondence: letter dated 11.7.1905.

4 Ibid., letter dated 26.7.1905.

replies in 1905. The questions were intended to determine the nature and extent of Church influence, both in the colleges and beyond. The effort on the part of Principals of the men's colleges to give a realistic reply to questions such as, 'What proportion of students entering Training College are convinced members of the Church of England and choose a Church college in preference to another because they desire to serve the Church?', showed that they had a sympathetic awareness of the limitations and experience of their young men. Both St. Mark's and Battersea made it clear that the questions appeared to show a lack of appreciation of the problems encountered in the men's colleges, with nominal Christians, ill-instructed for the most part and with no conviction of churchmanship.¹ Bede College pleaded that a non-obligatory Archbishops' Certificate would be a reform such as would make the college atmosphere and teaching a more powerful influence for good. The Principals of the women's colleges recognised the difficulty of answering the questions but their replies reveal that their problems were nowhere near as marked as those of the men's colleges. There was conformity among the students, if no greater assumption that this betokened conviction. Perhaps the best comment on the questionnaire is furnished by the Principal of York, in confessing to being puzzled by it. The impression that it gave that the sole

1 Other questions included: How far does the college atmosphere and teaching influence those students who are not at their entrance convinced Churchmen? What evidence have you been able to obtain of the influence of your students on the faith of their fellow-teachers or on their children? National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: Precis of answers made by Principals for Sub-Committee, 21.10.1905.

function of the colleges was to exert Church influence was so strong that he felt it necessary to point out that 'it should be borne in mind that when the Church of England built or helped to build the Training Colleges it was acting not merely in the interests of the Church but in the interests of education generally'.¹

There was some breakthrough in 1906 when the National Society agreed that Principals should be allowed to use their discretion in excusing individuals from the examinations 'for spiritual reasons',² and the Examining Board recognised that some elements of the course could be taught without the necessity of an examination.³ Many Principals were not happy about the examination of the distinctly liturgical elements of the syllabus, and the Examining Board therefore won approval for accepting a suggestion in 1908 that steps should be taken to assimilate the syllabus to those of Oxford and Cambridge Local Examinations and those of other public bodies.⁴

In general, however, the Minutes of the Council of Principals in this period give the impression that there was a running battle with the Examining Board, about both the nature and extent of the syllabus, which reflected a profound dissatisfaction with the whole

-
- 1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: Precis of answers made by Principals for Sub-Committee, 21.10.1905.
 - 2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 10, 22.1.1906, p. 408.
 - 3 Council of Principals: Minutes, 17.12.1908.
 - 4 National Society Correspondence: letter to Principals, 6.1.1908.

exercise. The dissatisfaction found recurrent expression in criticism of the value of the Archbishops' Certificate down to the end of the period covered by this study.¹

In the matter of the Religious Knowledge entrance examination it seemed that the issue of the 1907 Regulations, prohibiting any admission examination in addition to examinations approved by the Board of Education as qualifying for admission, would end the matter and give relief to those Principals anxious about the effect of such a requirement on recruitment.² But the prohibition was seen as part of a general attack on the Church colleges³, and in the resolution of that situation college authorities in 1909 were again permitted to require Church of England candidates to pass an entrance examination in Divinity.⁴ At the meeting of Principals in 1909 the Principal of Exeter made known his objections to an entrance examination but the general feeling of the meeting was that it should be retained, but discretion left to Principals in individual cases.⁵

By 1914, however, there had clearly been a shift in opinion, largely dictated by a shortage of candidates. It was at that time

1 See A. Lawrence (1958) St. Hild's College, 1858-1958, p. 27.

2 Board of Education (1907) Regulations for the Training of Teachers and for the Examination of Students in Training Colleges, p. 7.

3 See Part 2, Section III.

4 Board of Education (1909) Regulations for the Training of Teachers for Elementary Schools, p. vi.

5 Council of Principals: Minutes, 16.12.1909.

that the National Society set up an inquiry, under the Bishop of Wakefield, into the religious instruction of teachers, an inquiry which the Principals had asked for ten years earlier. Many colleges again questioned the value of examinations, and Cheltenham was reported not to permit students to take them, on the grounds that they 'ruin souls'.¹ As far as the entrance examination was concerned, the Principals were unanimous that it could not be insisted on. The reply from Chichester may be taken as indicating the general line of thinking. The Principal indicated that the college had little time for the Archbishops' entrance examination but would not want it to be abolished until something better took its place. The overwhelming consideration at that time, however, was that, in view of the shortage of candidates, 'it would be suicidal to reject those who have not passed the Archbishops' examination'.²

Principle had therefore to be sacrificed to necessity, but there was concern that the National Society intended to insist on the principle. The Principal of Bristol voiced that concern in warning the inquiry that, supposing such a thing to be desirable, 'it seems to me that it is quite beside the mark at present'.³ Many colleges were aware that they were not in a position to raise the money to put their buildings and facilities in such a state as

-
- 1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 11, 24.6.1914, p. 222.
 - 2 National Society, Chichester Correspondence: letter dated 6.2.1914.
 - 3 National Society Correspondence: letter to Principals, 4.1.1914, and Summary of Replies.

to compete on equal terms with newly built L.E.A. institutions. They could therefore not afford to have a further deterrent to recruitment in the form of a compulsory Religious Knowledge examination.

There is perhaps an irony in the fact that when the Principals met at the end of 1914, it was to report that the spirit in which the work had been done had greatly improved. Perhaps the outbreak of war and the departure of the men had had something to do with the improvement.¹

1 Council of Principals: Minutes, 17.12.1914.

CHAPTER 5

CHANGED CONDITIONS

The Board of Education in its Annual Report for 1908-09 permitted itself this comment on the Church colleges:

'It is perhaps not surprising that some of the institutions founded long ago for very different educational conditions ... should now be finding it difficult to retain a secured position in the general struggle to meet the wholly changed needs of the present day'.¹

The Board perhaps had principally in mind the condition of buildings and the provision of facilities, but there were other changes affecting the Church colleges.

The period saw the beginning of the end of the pupil-teacher system. From the beginning of 1904 the age of entry to pupil-teachership, raised to fourteen in 1877 and to fifteen in 1900, was raised to sixteen, except in rural areas where it was raised to fifteen. From 1905 pupil-teachers were to spend no more than half their time in school, and during the remainder they were to receive instruction, preferably in organised centres.² Robert Morant, according to his biographer, set his heart on the improvement of the quality of the teaching body. His promotion of Secondary schools was in order to make more suitable provision for the education of future teachers, and he urged local authorities to

1 Board of Education: Report, 1908-09, p. 48.

2 Board of Education: Report, 1902-03, p. 13.

provide scholarships to enable the best candidates for pupil-teacherships to have a general Secondary education.¹

The redefinition of a training college in the first separately issued Regulations for the Training of Teachers in 1904 was very much an expression of his thinking.

'The definition of a Training College hitherto has been: An institution for educating persons who are preparing to become Certificated teachers in Public Elementary Schools and for giving them instruction in the principles and practice of teaching.

'In the Regulations of the present year a Training College is defined as: An institution for instructing persons who are preparing to become Certificated teachers in Public Elementary Schools in the principles and practice of teaching, and for supplementing their education as far as may be necessary'.²

The reorganisation continued with the abolition, from 1907, of the King's Scholarship, an integral part of the pupil-teacher scheme since 1846, in favour of the Preliminary Examination for the Elementary School Teacher's Certificate, and in the same year Morant was responsible for the introduction of the Bursary system. His own thinking about the need to encourage Secondary education for intending teachers was confirmed by the deliberations of a Committee of H.M.I.s at that time, published as a General Report later in the year. Their conclusion was that 'the natural education for future teachers will only become possible when they can share it with boys and girls destined for other occupations, and have

1 B.M. Allen (1934) Sir Robert Morant: A Great Public Servant, pp. 208, 218.

2 Board of Education: Report, 1904-05, p. 40.

ceased to be regarded as a race apart'.¹ The new system made it possible for those in Secondary schools who intended to become teachers to receive a bursary enabling them to remain in school for a further year beyond the age of sixteen, at the end of which they could either try for entry to college immediately or serve for a year as Student-teachers and then enter college.²

The concern for the provision of better qualified lecturers to meet the needs of those coming into colleges with a Secondary school rather than a pupil-teacher background led to the insistence in the 1904 Regulations that in existing colleges alternate vacancies at least, in the non-graduate staff, were to be filled by appointments approved by the Board, until the position had been reached in which two-thirds of the teaching posts were held by those holding approved qualifications.³ There is no evidence that the Regulation caused undue anxiety in the Church of England or Methodist colleges. The Roman Catholics, however, while recognising that the provision was one which could not be quarrelled with, expressed some suspicion that the proportion stated was only the

-
- 1 Board of Education (1907) General Report on the Instruction and Training of Pupil-Teachers, 1903-7, p. 23.
 - 2 Board of Education: Report, 1906-07, p. 53.
 - 3 Board of Education (1904) Regulations for the Training of Teachers, p. 3. By 1914, when the majority of students qualified for entrance to college by means of examinations other than those for the Preliminary Certificate, the Voluntary Colleges had 62.1% of graduate staff as compared with 73.1% in the L.E.A. colleges. See L. Jones (1924) The Training of Teachers, p. 76.

thin end of the wedge, and they had an essentially practical concern on the ground that 'a Catholic who has had the advantage of a University Training is still rather a rara avis'.¹

The reorganisation of teacher-training, by which the encouraged mode of entry became a full Secondary schooling followed by two years in a college, inevitably led, as was intended, to a decline in the number of pupil-teachers which affected all colleges, but some Church colleges more than others. Both Winchester and Culham, drawing largely from rural areas, admitted in 1916 that they had suffered particularly from the decline of the pupil-teacher system and, surprisingly perhaps, St. Mark's owned to having lived on the remains of the system and to having 'practically never touched the student-teacher'.² Hence the request by the General Council of the Church of England Training Colleges to the National Society in 1912 to influence the clergy to encourage Bursars to go to Church colleges.³ Norwich too experienced difficulty because of the nature of its recruiting ground. It was reported that both Norfolk and Cambridgeshire had almost ceased to produce candidates for training.⁴

The decline in the number of pupil-teachers was not, however, matched by the intake of Bursars, and the recruitment of boys was

1 Catholic School Committee: Report, 1904, p. 26.

2 Training College Commission (1916) Report, pp. 24-5.

3 General Council of Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 23.2.1912.

4 National Society, Norwich Correspondence: letter from J.A. Hannah, Principal, 4.5.1915.

particularly affected, as may be seen from the following figures of Pupil-Teachers and Bursars recognised for the first time in England between 1906 and 1913.¹

Pupil-Teachers and Bursars, 1906-13

<u>Year</u>	<u>Pupil-Teachers</u> <u>beginning</u>		<u>Bursars</u>	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
1906	2,468	8,550	-	-
1907	2,092	8,205	637	1,406
1908	1,302	3,907	1,112	2,393
1909	894	1,956	1,090	2,251
1910	583	2,029	723	2,041
1911	393	1,562	723	2,135
1912	296	1,173	614	2,225
1913	251	1,203	598	2,434

The consequence, of course, was a general shortage of candidates, made worse by the activity of the National Union of Teachers which, alarmed by teacher unemployment, was concerned from 1909 to dissuade entrants to the profession in order to bring pressure to bear on employing authorities.² It is this general shortage which forms the background to the anxiety about competition from local authority colleges and about the effect of religious knowledge requirements. The Church colleges were in a buyer's market. They had little choice.

1 Board of Education: Report, 1912-13, p. 149.

2 See A. Tropp (1957) The School Teachers, p. 188.

The admission by the Principal of Warrington in 1912, that the college had 'taken in some we should have refused formerly', could have been echoed in many other colleges.¹ The general mood of pessimism was given expression in the Archbishops' Inspector's comment in 1914 that the colleges were doing their best 'but the present is a time to be silent about many matters in a public report'.²

-
- 1 National Society, St. Katharine's Liverpool Correspondence: Reply to National Society Enquiry, 1912.
 - 2 National Society: Annual Report, 1914, p. 122.

CHAPTER 6

THE NATIONAL SOCIETY

The National Society was not slow to respond to the situation. At the request of the General Council of Church Training Colleges it undertook an extensive publicity campaign in 1912 to bring home to intending teachers the essential difference between the spirit and atmosphere, as well as the religious teaching, which would be found in a Church training college as compared with others.¹ At the same time it made the very positive statement that the Society felt bound to be prepared to give the colleges the substantial additional financial help they would need if there were no improvement in the recruitment position.² But perhaps the most helpful action taken by the Society was to throw its weight behind the effort to stem the decline of candidates from country areas. It added its support to the efforts of the General Council of the Church Colleges to bring about a return to the pupil-teacher system in a modified form.

This could be judged a reactionary move, in that one of the concerns which lay behind it was the fact that the virtual disappearance of the pupil-teacher system had removed candidates for teaching from the direct influence and oversight of the Church, because they were in maintained Secondary schools. But there were

1 National Society: Annual Report, 1912, p. 18.

2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 12, 31.7.1912, p. 64.



other concerns. The bursary system itself was felt to be not a testing of vocation, or a weeding out process in the way that the pupil-teacher system had operated. Thus the General Council was anxious to 'secure in the case of boys and girls who show an aptitude, a continuous association from an early age with the principles and practice of teaching'.¹

The third area of concern, shared by other bodies, was that under the new system the opportunities for working class children, especially in country districts, to enter the teaching profession were seriously diminished.²

The Society therefore welcomed the provision made in 1913 for those pupil-teachers whose homes were not within reach of a Secondary school or pupil-teacher centre. Local authorities were permitted to appoint pupil-teachers at fourteen years of age and to make the necessary arrangements for their instruction.³ The National Society drew attention to the importance of the utilisation of these provisions by the Church⁴, and the Bishop of Wakefield followed this

-
- 1 General Council of Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 29.11.1912.
 - 2 See B. Simon (1965) Education and the Labour Movement, 1870-1920, p. 269, for the reaction of the T.U.C. to what it considered to be a deliberate policy of closing the door of the teaching profession to the working man's children by the postponement of the time of wage-earning involved in the Bursar system.
 - 3 Board of Education (1913) Regulations for the Preliminary Education of Elementary School Teachers, pp. 2, 7, 16. During the first year they were to pursue a general education without employment or training in teaching. Grants were made to the local authority in respect of the instruction given by the Head and in aid of the authority's expenditure for approved supplementary instruction. Schemes were to be submitted for recognition by the Board.
 - 4 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 11, 5.3.1914, p. 196.

up by a letter to all Diocesan Boards. He saw the possibility of co-operation with local authorities 'where they have shown themselves reasonably friendly' and a role for the junior clergy in the arrangements for supplementary instruction.¹

The possibilities opened up would certainly have been welcomed in many dioceses, and the provision contributed to the fact that the recruitment of pupil-teachers lingered on here and there up to the outbreak of the Second World War. The Bishop of Gloucester was quick to take action to bring about the re-establishment of the pupil-teacher system in his diocese², and we know that Norfolk was enabled by the provisions to begin to entertain hopes of again producing an adequate number of candidates.³

The Archbishops' Inspector reported in 1914 that 'some colleges feel crushed by competition'.⁴ That is certainly the impression one gains from the replies of the colleges to the question put to them during the war about their views on their recruitment prospects. The colleges for women in general had fewer anxieties than those for men. But only the Home and Colonial College, Truro, Tottenham, Whitelands, Hockerill and Cheltenham

-
- 1 National Society Correspondence: letter dated 6.4.1914.
 - 2 National Society Correspondence: letter from the Bishop of Gloucester to the Bishop of Wakefield, 8.4.1914.
 - 3 National Society, Norwich Correspondence: letter from J.A. Hannah, Principal, 4.5.1915.
 - 4 National Society: Annual Report, 1914, p. 122.

expressed no fear of competition. Derby felt so crushed by its weight that it named eight colleges as rivals for its candidates. Among the men's colleges only Cheltenham and Battersea felt that they could look to the future with confidence.¹

The replies were inevitably based on their immediate past experience. And in 1914 the prospects for the new academic year were gloomy. The women's colleges seemed likely to fill their places, but only at the cost of admitting many who, in the opinion of the Archbishops' Inspector, would never be of any use as teachers.² Five of the men's colleges, including St. Mark's, Bede, York and Winchester were in danger of not securing their full complement of entrants. St. Mark's seemed likely to have thirty vacancies at a cost of £80 per place. The threatened overall loss to the colleges was therefore considerable.³

Hockerill College planted the seeds of an idea which was to take twenty years to mature, when it suggested that 'in the present difficult times a co-operative fund might help'.⁴ The thought was echoed by the Archbishops' Inspector in 1914 when he added his contribution to the prevailing mood of pessimism and declared that it was time that the Church provided what he termed a 'Sustentation Fund' for its colleges.⁵

1 Training College Commission (1916) Report, pp. 23-26.

2 National Society: Annual Report, 1913, p. 112.

3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 11, 4.3.1914, p. 188.

4 National Society, Hockerill Correspondence: Suggestions contained in a National Society Return, 1913.

5 National Society: Annual Report, 1914, p. 122.

But by a savage irony, it was probably the war which saved the Church of England colleges for men.

SECTION III

THE GOVERNMENT CHALLENGE

CHAPTER 1

THE 1907 REGULATIONS

'In 1908', says Lloyd, 'England was wearing its liberalism with emotion and passion'.¹ He uses these words with reference to theological scholarship at the time, but also with reference to the political climate, and sees the two inter-acting. The Liberal Party had been returned to power in January 1906 with the overwhelming support of the electorate. Three hundred and seventy-seven Liberals were returned to the House of Commons, together with fifty-three Labour members, while the Tory opposition numbered only one hundred and fifty-seven.² The Government was pledged to a radical programme, including a measure which would undo the religious settlement of the 1902 Act, and the introduction of a Conscience Clause into the residential colleges in 1908 may be seen as a manoeuvre in the conflict of Church and State over education as much as a measure to ease Nonconformist hardship in securing places in training colleges.

The hardship was real and not imagined, for out of a total of 5,201 places in residential colleges in 1906, 4,142 were open only to candidates belonging to some particular denomination.³ The sense of injustice, built up over the years, was fed by the

1 R. Lloyd (1966) The Church of England, 1900-1965, p. 105.

2 B. Simon (1965) Education and the Labour Movement, 1870-1920, p. 250.

3 Board of Education: Report, 1906-07, p. 16.

knowledge that of the 1,518 First Class Queen's Scholars in 1901, 485 applied for 400 places in non-sectarian colleges, and only 937 were admitted to the denominational colleges. The remainder of places was filled with religiously conforming candidates from lower down the Class List.¹

The opening of hostels by the Church of England colleges, and the admission of day students with a Conscience Clause, was hardly likely to have been regarded as an adequate solution, although the Archbishop of Canterbury clearly hoped that the moves would meet the needs of the time. Writing to St. Katharine's, Tottenham, in 1906, to commend the policy, he urged the college so to act 'as to give our Denominational Colleges the best chance of a permanent place in our educational system'.² The cost of that permanent place, however, demanded by the Liberals and their Nonconformist supporters, was to be considerably higher.

Birrell, the first President of the Board of Education in the Liberal administration, brought in a Bill in April 1906, intended to put an end to the dual system created by the Act of 1902.³ In

-
- 1 B. Sacks (1961) The Religious Issue in the State Schools of England and Wales, 1902-14, p. 34.
 - 2 G. Handley (1978) The College of All Saints, 1878-1978, p. 12.
 - 3 The principle of undenominationalism in Birrell's Bill was defended by the young William Temple, then a layman and Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. He urged the extension of the principle to the training colleges in his first public speech at the 1906 Church Congress in Barrow in Furness. 'The centre of the whole position is the training colleges, and we must secure that the training colleges are full of religious influence. Let us press the Government hard to the conclusion of their own measure ... Let them also establish religious undenominationalism in the training colleges'. F.A. Iremonger (1948) William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, pp. 91-3. Temple was to change his mind on this matter at a later period.

May of the same year, a Memorandum on the future of the Church training colleges came before the Cabinet. In it, Birrell showed the political and religious pressures working for change. From one direction there was a growing feeling in the Liberal Party that it was 'contrary to sound principles of religious equality and civic duty' that residential colleges of purely denominational character, yet practically wholly maintained out of State funds, should continue to exist. From the other direction there was the Nonconformist impatience with the solution favoured by the previous administration, because the local authorities were proving very slow to provide colleges. The nature of Birrell's dilemma is very clear. While it was becoming very difficult to defend in the House of Commons the continued grants of public money to denominational colleges, immediate withdrawal of grants would involve closure of the colleges, and the country would face a grave shortage of training facilities.

The question to be faced was whether a college could be forced to admit residential students, as opposed to day students, without a religious test. It was not the solution Birrell favoured, for with remarkable foresight he saw that Nonconformist students 'would be almost certain to conform to the general character of the place so far as attending services and religious instruction are concerned'. However, in the unlikely event of undenominational colleges being provided quickly enough, even with the proposed 75% building grant, there was no other option, Birrell believed, open to the Government.¹

1 CAB 37/83 The Question of the Continuance of State Grants to Denominational Training Colleges and Secondary Schools, 30.5.1906. Public Record Office.

After almost a year's silence, which the Archbishops' Inspector found 'ominous',¹ and after the withdrawal of Birrell's Bill, his successor, R. McKenna, urged a decision on the Cabinet before presenting the 1907 Regulations to Parliament. He was prepared to continue grants to existing colleges, only if they would accept a Conscience Clause. He personally would have liked to go further but saw the impossibility of doing so because the colleges would give up rather than comply. He felt that he would have the support of the Commons for what he proposed, 'but the issues raised are so important and the denominational objections may be so strenuous' that he felt he had to take the whole matter to the Cabinet before issuing the Regulations.²

McKenna had a very good idea, therefore, of the hornets' nest he was stirring up. It was no doubt because of this awareness that the discussions between the parties concerned, which had normally taken place before the introduction of any educational measure, were in this case conspicuous by their absence. The storm that burst, on the publication of the Regulations in 1907, left him in no doubt that he had a battle on his hands.

By 1908 the grip of the Board of Education on the administration of the training colleges was already strong. Its approval was necessary for the founding of a new college or the enlargement

1 National Society: Annual Report, 1906, p. 113.

2 CAB 37/88 The Denominational Difficulty in Secondary Schools and Training Colleges, April 1907. Public Record Office.

of an existing one, and for all appointments to the academic staff. It had control over the number of students a college might admit, and the entry qualifications required, and its approval was required for the introduction of new courses or the alteration of existing ones. All this the colleges accepted, with varying degrees of willingness, as the price of financial support without which they could not have existed. But the Regulations which were to govern the entry of students from 1908 were seen by the Roman Catholic and Church of England colleges as an attempt to exercise control, of an altogether different order. Here was an attack on the very raison d'être of the colleges, an attempt to destroy their denominational character overnight. There was bitterness too, that the Government was attempting to bring about by Regulation what it could not do by legislation. The Principal of Brighton was quick to point out that Regulations were intended to reduce Acts already passed to a practical shape, and not to originate a totally new policy.¹

The two clauses giving particular offence were 8d. and 8h.:

- 8d. 'In no circumstances may the application of a candidate be rejected on the ground of religious faith or by reason of his refusal to undertake to attend or to abstain from attending any place of religious worship, or any religious observance, or instruction in religious subjects, in the College or elsewhere'.

1 National Society, Brighton Correspondence: letter from G. Corfield, 18.7.1907.

- 8h. 'No recognised student may be required to withdraw from a College or Hostel on any ground similar to those set forth in 8d.'¹

The events which followed the publication of the Regulations are significant as illustrating the difference between the religious communions, and within the group of Anglican colleges in their reaction to that central body which emerged with oversight of the Church of England colleges, in matters relating to the crisis.

1 Board of Education (1907) Regulations for the Training of Teachers, p. 7.

CHAPTER 2

THE METHODIST AND ROMAN CATHOLIC REACTION

With the Methodist Church the battle was never joined. There were regrets that the personal interview with the candidates was no longer practicable because the Regulations made it necessary in future for the colleges to bear all the expenses of such interviews, and the Wesleyan Education Committee could not afford the sum of £250 needed to meet such expenses. This was felt by the colleges to be a departure of the greatest moment, and the Principal of Westminster held out as long as possible.¹ On the central issue, however, the Committee acted 'in strict accordance not only with the letter but also with the Spirit of the Regulations in all correspondence and enquiries'.²

This reaction should not surprise us. The Methodist Conference had determined in 1901 that Methodists other than Wesleyans should be admitted to Westminster and Southlands, without being expected to sever their membership of their own religious communities.³ The Church would not have expected members of other religious bodies to react any differently. Indeed, the President of the Conference in his valedictory address to the students in 1902 played down the denominational influence of the colleges. 'In our Training Colleges we have emphasised conversion, experience, fellowship and discipline, rather than denominational orthodoxy ... we have preserved our

1 F.C. Pritchard (1951) The Story of Westminster College, 1851-1951, p. 107.

2 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1907-08, p. 26.

3 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1901-02, p. 30.

doctrinal unity by means of our spiritual experience'.¹ What he chose to emphasise in the work of the college was the exercise of that general Christian influence which he saw as essential in a teacher of the young, mindful of Wesley's teaching that religion constitutes the sum total of the faith a man professes and the life he leads.² Thus religious education does not mean instruction in religious knowledge but a whole education which should express the religious point of view in all things and issue in an improved morality and social consciousness.

The battle was well and truly joined with the Roman Catholics. Their stand was uncompromising. The introduction of a Conscience Clause into the colleges could not, and would not, be tolerated. This was the burden of the message of the deputation to the Prime Minister led by Archbishop Bourne on July 25th. No punches were pulled. The Archbishop declared that 'some of these regulations would certainly be disobeyed by Catholics' and the Prime Minister's reply met with considerable interruption. The Archbishop insisted that the only point which mattered was whether or not the Regulations interfered with the Catholic character of the colleges.³ If they would make it impossible to continue to give that fundamental purpose and interpretation to the educative process, which Carrigan

1 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1901-02, p. 85.

2 H.F. Matthews (1949) Methodism and the Education of the People, p. 120.

3 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1907, p. 25.

considers to have been the contribution of the Catholic colleges, then they would be resisted.¹

The strong stand taken by the Roman Catholics perhaps took the Government by surprise, for McKenna had assured his colleagues and the colleges that since no non-Catholic would want to go to a Catholic college the Regulations would be of non-effect.² The knowledge, however, by the Archbishop's deputation that already four or five applications had been received from non-Catholics for entry to Mount Pleasant, Liverpool, was enough to show that no reliance could be placed on Board of Education assurances.³

Moreover, the Roman Catholics were on very strong ground, for in a sense the battle had been won some years earlier. The original proposal to open a college in Salford had been made in 1899, but had been approved by the Education Department only with the proviso that there should be a day student element, admitted with a Conscience Clause, such as had been insisted on before the approval of the new Church of England college, St. Gabriel's, Kennington. The Catholic authorities had firmly resolved that they would not open a college on such terms.⁴ Negotiations had continued for the

1 D. Carrigan (1961) The Catholic Teachers' Colleges in the United Kingdom, 1850-1960, p. 172.

2 CAB 37/88 The Denominational Difficulty in Secondary Schools and Training Colleges, April 1907. Public Record Office.

3 National Society Correspondence: Report of Interview with F.R. Anderton, Secretary, Catholic Education Council, 22.7.1907.

4 Catholic School Committee: Report, 1899, p. 17.

next three years, with the Board of Education insisting on the same conditions as at Kennington and the Committee insisting on the impossibility of carrying out the education of their students from a Catholic point of view under such conditions. At length the Board had given way, and 'the desired recognition was suddenly intimated to the Authorities in August 1903'.¹

What lay behind this surrender we can only surmise. Presumably additional provision was necessary and the Board came to the conclusion that it would not be provided if they maintained their stance. The correspondence throws no light on the matter. A letter from Morant urged the provision of a new college and indicated that the Board would not insist on the admission of non-Catholic day students if the authorities were to apply for recognition.² The letter notifying the religious community providing the college of the Board's approval takes us no further, but is interesting for the Council Secretary's comment that there was likely to be a storm when the Anglicans discovered that 'we have got what they could not get with the strong support of the late Archbishop of Canterbury and the National Society'.³

It was indeed a case of double standards on the part of the Board, but the Roman Catholics had shown they were prepared to forego further provision unless it were on the same conditions as

1 Catholic School Committee: Report, 1903, p. 37.

2 Catholic Education Council: letter from Robert Morant, 15.7.1903.

3 Catholic Education Council: letter to the Reverend Mother of the Faithful Companions of Jesus, 8.8.1903.

prevailed in their existing colleges. It was this intransigence which the Board again encountered in 1907. The nature of the case to be put by the deputation had been intimated to the Secretary of the National Society by his counterpart in the Catholic Education Council, a few days earlier. The intention with which they started was to defy the Regulations, and if the grants were stopped then the colleges would close. Faced as they were with that drastic possibility, they 'could not for a moment contemplate admitting any students who were not Roman Catholics'.¹

The Board of Education knew, from bitter experience, that the position having been stated, there would be no going back. Indeed the Roman Catholic resolution went further than refusal to admit non-Catholics. At Hammersmith in 1907 the rule insisting on the admission only of those who had passed the diocesan religious examinations was for the first time enforced. No doubt this was at the insistence of the Catholic Education Council, for the Principal appears to have been an unwilling executor and regretted the loss of some good candidates as a result. The proscription of any Religious Knowledge entrance examination from 1908 was acknowledged but ignored, the Principal commenting, 'Time will tell whether this, as well as other recent changes can after all be put in force'.² As far as the Catholic community was concerned, they

1 National Society Correspondence: Report of Interview with F.R. Anderton, 22.7.1907.

2 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1907, p. 35.

could not be put into operation, and when amendments made them acceptable to the Anglicans for 1908 such amendments did not merit a mention in the Annual Report of the Catholic Education Council because they in no way affected the fundamental issue at stake. Runciman, McKenna's successor, could reply in 1909 to a letter from a Member of Parliament anxious to allay the fears of twelve thousand Catholics in his constituency, that he doubted whether the Regulations had inflicted any hardship at all on the Catholic colleges.¹ It was, however, the intention with which the community was concerned. In practice the Regulations were simply ignored, and as far as we know the colleges incurred no penalties.

The Roman Catholic Church has never claimed to have concern with the general education of the whole community. Their primary purpose in education is explicitly domestic. The classic formula for the Catholic system of education has been: 'Every Catholic child from a Catholic home to be taught by Catholic teachers in a Catholic school'.² Thus the whole curriculum and teaching was organised within a Catholic framework and when Carrigan speaks of the 'Catholic and professional purposes' of a college, they are both part of the overall domestic purpose.³ It has to be admitted,

-
- 1 CAB 37/101 Regulations of the Board of Education for the Training of Teachers and the Objections of Roman Catholics thereto. Letter to J. Walton, M.P., from W. Runciman, 30.11.1909. Public Record Office.
 - 2 The Fourth R (1970) The Report of the Commission on Religious Education in Schools, (Durham), p. 208.
 - 3 D. Carrigan (1961) The Catholic Teachers' Colleges in the United Kingdom, 1850-1960, p. 73.

however, that already by 1913 it was not practicable to enforce an agreement to serve only in Catholic schools¹, but the continuing involvement of the Roman Catholic religious communities with the teacher-training institutions, and living under vows which make them exemplars of vocation has, while making for a certain amount of tension in the colleges, also ensured that the Catholic ideal has never ceased to be placed before their students. The overtly evangelical tone of teacher-training has perhaps survived rather longer in the Roman Catholic colleges than it has in those of the Anglican Church.

1 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1913, p. 25.

CHAPTER 3

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND REACTION

Following the publication of the Regulations in July 1907, immediate action was taken at the highest level. The Archbishop of Canterbury summoned a meeting of the Consultative Committee of the National Society on 19th July¹, and on the following day led a strong deputation, which included the Principals of Warrington, Battersea and St. Mark's, to see the Prime Minister and Reginald McKenna. The firm, even pugnacious, stand taken by the Roman Catholics a few days later perhaps owed something to the knowledge that the Anglican deputation had met with no satisfaction other than the assurance that when there were enough undenominational colleges the current problem would disappear.²

In the wake of that disappointment a meeting of Principals was held at the National Society's office on 24th July, under the chairmanship of the Archbishop. What took place at this meeting is revealed in a Private and Unofficial letter from the Secretary to the Secretary of the Catholic Education Council. It was agreed that, as required by the Regulations, names of applicants would be entered in a register in the order in which they were received, but that a non-committal reply to the effect that applications would be considered in due course, should be sent. Clergy were to be

1 National Society Consultative Committee: Minutes, p. 28.

2 ED 24/489 Training College Regulations, 1907. Public Record Office.

advised, however, to ensure that applications from Church of England members reached Principals by 1st August, the first day of registration. The position was to be reviewed in the autumn, though the Secretary thought that the question of the treatment of the applications would be further adjourned until as full a picture as possible was available as to how non-Anglican applications would affect the colleges. It would be the view of the situation likely in 1908 that would determine the course taken.¹

It is clear from this that the Church of England colleges were not going to make a stand on the oft-expressed principle that the imposition of a Conscience Clause would destroy the unity of corporate life.² This perhaps was understandable, for the Board was making it clear that it could not 'hope to meet objections which have been taken on a point of principle'.³ The main consideration at this meeting appears to have been avoidance of an immediate announcement that the colleges would not conform to the Regulations, an announcement which would give the Government 'the opportunity and perhaps incitement' to ask for a large vote for new undenominational colleges, to provide further competition.⁴ The difference of approach explains why in this period we do not find the Anglicans and Roman Catholics taking joint action, despite

1 National Society Correspondence: letter to F.R. Anderton, 25.7.1907.

2 Council of Principals: Minutes, 6.7.1907.

3 Board of Education: Report, 1906-07, p. 57.

4 National Society Correspondence: letter to F.R. Anderton, 25.7.1907.

being urged to do so by the Principals of both Mount Pleasant and St. Mary's, Hammersmith.¹

The meeting throws light on the activities of the remainder of the summer, for it was then that the National Society called for an examination of the Trust Deeds of the colleges, and invited representatives to a meeting on 25th October. There it was decided to seek Counsel's advice on how far the observance of the new Regulations would conflict with the Trust Deeds if non-Church of England members were to be admitted. The case was to be fought on legal grounds.²

It was further decided at the October meeting that a Committee of college representatives, under the Bishop of St. Albans, should be set up to consider the Opinion of Counsel, 'keeping in view the necessity for securing united action on the part of the Church Training Colleges'.³ Here was the beginning of a machinery, to act in a strictly limited way, on behalf of the colleges as a whole, and it was the National Society to which was entrusted the task of appointing the Committee by the representatives assembled in October.⁴

The Committee went into deliberation on receipt of Counsel's Opinion on 20th November and echoed the expert finding that it was

1 Council of Principals: Minutes, 7.6.1907 and 24.10.1907.

2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 11, 31.10.1907, p. 131.

3 Ibid.

4 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: Circular to Principals, 25.10.1907.

not possible to observe the Regulations without committing a breach of obligations contained in the Trust Deeds. The Committee was, however, prepared to recommend to Governing Bodies a considerable extension of the hostel system. The Archbishop was asked to make a public pronouncement on behalf of the Society and the colleges, but the latter were advised, presumably in the hope of modification of the Regulations, not to give a definite refusal of admission to Nonconformist candidates until it became absolutely necessary.¹

The recommendations of the Committee were endorsed by a conference of representatives of the colleges on 6th December. The general mood was that which had been expressed just before the meeting by the Council of Whitelands in a resolution not to accept the imposition of the Regulations as they stood², but there was a dissenting voice which, while standing out alone in 1907, in fact represented the position which fundamentally was that of the Anglican authorities. Cheltenham agreed to send three representatives to the 6th December meeting but made it plain that 'the mind of this Committee is against a deliberate attitude of defiance of the Government'.³ In his reply, the Secretary of the National Society insisted that no attitude of defiance had been taken up, though the conference had plainly declared the inability of the

-
- 1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 11, 4.12.1907, p. 148.
 - 2 National Society, Whitelands Correspondence: Notice of Resolutions, 3.12.1907.
 - 3 National Society, Cheltenham Correspondence: letter from H.A. Bren, 3.12.1907.

colleges to accept the new Regulations, and all colleges, in the Opinion of Counsel, stood in exactly the same position.¹

The Archbishop informed McKenna of Counsel's Opinion on 9th December, and the reply could have brought little comfort. It recognised that it was on legal grounds that the objection of the Church was being argued and therefore in reply to that case offered the Board's assistance in amending the terms of any inconvenient Trust Deed.² The National Society's reaction to this reply was that 'Cynicism could no further go'.³

The situation was one of impasse, and though the Committee appointed by the National Society to examine Counsel's Opinion had finished its work, the need for such a body remained. At the 6th December conference the Bishop of St. Albans proposed that a Central Committee be constituted⁴, and what was called the Central Provisional Committee met at the National Society's office on 8th January, 1908. It set up a defensive machinery to counter the dangers of the time. Governing Bodies were to nominate three

-
- 1 National Society, Cheltenham Correspondence: letter to H.A. Bren, 9.12.1907. The other Evangelical institution, the Home and Colonial College, whose rules permitted the admission of other than Church of England members, expressed its wish to be associated with the united effort, 'to secure such modifications of the Regulations as we all desire'. National Society, Home and Colonial Correspondence: letter from D.J. Thomas, 30.11.1907.
 - 2 ED 24/491 The St. Albans Compromise, 1907-08. Letter to the Archbishop, 23.1.1908.
 - 3 National Society: Annual Report, 1908, p. 14.
 - 4 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: Extracts from Agenda Paper, Training College Conference, 6.12.1907.

representatives, including at least one layman, to serve on a General Council which would be concerned with all legislation and Departmental Regulations affecting the colleges. An Executive of fifteen was to watch events and whenever necessary take immediate action in the name of the colleges. But, significantly, its actions were subject to the approval of both the General Council and the Governing Bodies of the colleges. Its executive role was therefore limited. In an unprecedented move, however, affecting the independence of the colleges, the Governing Bodies were asked to take no action in the current crisis without prior reference to the Chairman of the General Council.¹

In the emergence of this General Council the National Society saw good coming out of evil², but it was a body called forth to deal with a particular situation and did not look beyond that situation. It was in no sense a Central Governing Body to which individual colleges had assigned their autonomy or their right to take independent action. There was no official link with the Council of Principals, which served to emphasise the fact that the latter body was merely an informal deliberative gathering.

The first meeting of the General Council took place on 3rd February, 1908, though it was not until 1911 that Bede College appointed a layman representative in accordance with the constitution.³ The Bishop of St. Albans was appointed Chairman and it was

1 General Council of the Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 8.1.1908.

2 National Society: Annual Report, 1908, p. 8.

3 National Society, Bede Correspondence: letter from Rev. D. Jones, 26.5.1911.

agreed that the administrative work would be undertaken by the National Society, with its Secretary acting as Honorary Secretary to the Council. The meeting made clear that the colleges would not apply for amending schemes, but would accept a hostel solution to the problem, which would not interfere with the religious life and character of a college.¹ The Archbishop informed Morant of the Council's view and stressed that if a college were to retain its religious character, the hostel solution was the only one possible, and especially if the Conscience Clause could be interpreted to admit of 'students claiming exemption from religious teaching and observances on the mere ground that they did not wish for such'.²

In introducing the 1907 Regulations the primary purpose had been to facilitate the entry of Nonconformists to the Church of England colleges. It is clear that at that time the wider possibilities arising out of their admission had not been foreseen. In reply to a query from Saltley, the Board indicated that a student could not refuse to attend religious worship or instruction from term to term in order to have greater leisure, but only on 'conscientious grounds'. The implication was that the term meant, not being a member of the Church of England, for the student would be expected to attend the religious observances of his own

1 General Council: Minutes, 3.2.1908.

2 ED 24/491 The St. Albans Compromise, 1907-08. Letter from the Archbishop, 22.2.1908.

denomination if such were accessible.¹ The matter was to become of crucial importance in the resolution of the crisis.

It had been agreed at the first meeting of the General Council that no candidate was to be refused, except on the ground of 'plain moral, physical or intellectual disability' until the publication of the Preliminary Certificate List, and colleges were later advised not to divulge to the Board the terms on which they would, or would not, accept candidates.² Some colleges, however, exercised their independence and took a different line. Lincoln in fact had already done so at the outset of the affair, indicating to the Board of Education that it was prepared under protest to accept the Regulations for one year.³ The Principal of Exeter, R.H. Couchman, who seems to have shared that dread of the admission of Nonconformists into a Church college which made his predecessor resign in protest on publication of the 1907 Regulations, was in no mood to compromise.⁴ His reply to a Congregationalist applicant

-
- 1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter from the Secretary to the Bishop of St. Albans, 28.3.1908. At Derby up to 1927 all Nonconformists had to enter in a book each Sunday the name of the Church attended. M. Dobson (1951) The First Hundred Years of the Diocesan Training College, Derby, p. 37.
 - 2 General Council: Minutes, 3.2.1908 and 28.2.1908.
 - 3 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter from Lincoln to the Bishop of St. Albans, 17.6.1908.
 - 4 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: Precis of Answers made by Principals for Sub-Committee, 21.10.1905. Replies of Dr. Dangar.

for 1908 was a statement that entrants would be subject to the college rules as regards religious instruction and worship then in force. The Board not unnaturally pointed out that if the college persisted in its attitude then its Government grants would be at risk.¹

In forwarding Exeter's letter to the Board the rejected candidate asserted that other Church colleges treated Nonconformist candidates in a similar manner and enclosed copies of letters received from Battersea and Culham.² The Principal of Exeter, having found himself in trouble, then sought the advice of the General Council and was requested to reply that the Board's letter was being referred to the Council. The delaying tactic was explained by the Secretary in his comment that 'we are not without hope that a working arrangement may yet be arrived at', and it was therefore important that a definite reply to the Board should be postponed as long as possible.³

The ground of hope is made plain in a letter from the Bishop of St. Albans to Talbot Baines, Secretary of the National Society, on 28th March. He communicated the view of the Archbishop that McKenna did not wish to push matters to an issue, and was in fact marking time, 'till a successor relieves him of his office and probably of his policy'.⁴ His departure from office in the following

-
- 1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter from R.G. Mayor to Exeter, 26.3.1908.
 - 2 Ibid., copy letter from Mr. E. Luery to R. McKenna, undated 1908.
 - 3 Ibid., letter to R.H. Couchman, 2.4.1908.
 - 4 Ibid., letter dated 28.3.1908.

month, and the succession of Walter Runciman as President of the Board, brought hope of a way out of the impasse in which the Board stood firm behind the Regulations, and the Church equally firm behind the legal argument and the hostel policy. In fact, the Church became somewhat more militant just before McKenna's departure, with the General Council insisting that the numbers of Nonconformists admitted to a college must be in addition to the number of students for which the college was recognised, and that colleges should receive allowance for those students as though they were all resident.¹

1 General Council: Minutes, 11.3.1908.

CHAPTER 4

THE SETTLEMENT

In Walter Runciman the Archbishop found a man with qualities of diplomacy and tact, apparently lacking in his predecessor, with whom he could negotiate. The following months were spent in such negotiations, at the same time as the two men were in frequent contact over a further attempt by the Government to modify the 1902 provisions relating to Voluntary schools. Bell says that Archbishop Davidson's relations with Mr. Runciman 'were strengthened into a fine mutual trust through all the changes and chances of the Education Bill of 1908', and Davidson was personally disappointed when it was withdrawn because it could not count on the general support of the Church.¹ That fine mutual trust evidently extended to the settlement of the training college problem.

The attitude of the Archbishop is revealed in a letter from Talbot Baines to the Principal of Battersea, reporting that he was anxious to act reasonably in the matter and that things would not be pressed to a crisis if he could help it, though he was being pressed by political supporters not to give way.² That too seems to have been the attitude adopted by Runciman, who made the suggestion to the Archbishop that if the General Council were to

1 G.K.A. Bell (1935) Randall Davidson, p. 577.

2 National Society, Battersea Correspondence: 25.5.1908.

send a letter to the Board offering to accept 50% of candidates in 1908 without reference to denominational qualifications, the Board would raise no questions as to how the students were to be housed. Hostels and even lodgings could count as residence and would be held to satisfy the Regulations. In arriving at this suggestion Morant made it clear to the Bishop of St. Albans that the question was 'wholly political and not an educational one at all', and that Runciman could go no further without raising a storm such as would compel his resignation.¹

It remained for the Bishop, on behalf of the General Council, to inform the colleges of Mr. Runciman's suggestion. His letter made no acknowledgement of how far the Government had changed its position, but stressed the 'exceptional generosity' of any offer the Church might make, an offer which would be for one year only. A draft of a proposed letter to the Board was enclosed for consideration and colleges were asked to comment on the desirability of stating an actual limit of 50% in view of the fact that the number of Nonconformists registered for 1908 was already known to be small. The views of the colleges were also sought on the question of whether Nonconformist students should be considered as additional students, an insistence which would be likely to make for difficulty with the Board.²

1 General Council: Minutes, 10.6.1908.

2 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter to Principals and Governing Bodies, 11.6.1908.

The fourteen extant replies show that only St. Hild's and Salisbury were in favour of stating a limit, though both qualified their replies. Chester and Warrington said they would accept the majority view, and Peterborough and Chester declared that, whatever limit was stated, they could accept only ten. Oxford, with only thirty-eight places, said that it would take twelve day students but the places would be open to both Church and Nonconformist applicants.¹ Any statement of a 50% limit would evidently be a cosmetic exercise to satisfy Runciman's political friends, but bearing no relation either to known demand or to intention on the part of the colleges. Four colleges thought that Nonconformists should count as additional students, but only seven colleges made their views known on this question.²

It was apparently only at a very late stage in the negotiations that a possible consequence of the Conscience Clause was realised and action taken to prevent it. The Principal of Carmarthen had

-
- 1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letters dated June 1908.
 - 2 Ibid., letters dated June 1908. Lincoln's reply to the Bishop was that they had already made their position clear to the Board and there would be no going back on it; letter dated 17.6.1908. Whatever the Council decided would not affect Lincoln's decision. The attitude of Lincoln to the Council, which had come into being under the auspices of the National Society, is perhaps not surprising in view of Lincoln's earlier attempt to form a central organisation, to which the Society had been markedly unsympathetic. See Part 2, Section I, Chapter 5.

put the matter bluntly. The Conscience Clause could apply to Churchmen. 'We can agree to his (Runciman's) terms and yet not admit a single Nonconformist'.¹ Thus at the meeting of the General Council on 24th June to approve the letter to the Board a last-minute amendment by Lord Cobham was approved, and it was agreed that the letter should make clear that the Conscience Clause was not to apply to students who were members of the Church of England. The letter was to state an actual limit of 50% of places under the Clause, for whatever the objections of some colleges to this it could hardly be omitted in view of Runciman's specific request.²

This compromise with the Government was put to the vote and carried by a majority of 36 to 9. The voting figures are significant for, with each college entitled to three representatives, some colleges were either under-represented or not represented at all at what was a crucial meeting. This could be an indication that some colleges had little confidence in the Council's ability substantially to alter the situation. Some colleges, knowing by this time that the actual demand for places from Nonconformists was small, and others determined to go their own way whatever the outcome, may have had little interest in the proceedings.

1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter to Bishop of St. Albans, 16.6.1908.

2 General Council: Minutes, 24.6.1908.

The three National Society London college Principals voted with the minority, and Whitelands accused the Council of acting ultra vires because under the constitution the decision should have been referred to each college Governing Body. Talbot Baines, Secretary of the Society, agreed with the protest and expressed surprise that there had been no reaction from the Standing Committee. He counselled the colleges, however, not to stand out from the arrangement.¹

On 25th June, the Bishop of St. Albans spent an hour and three-quarters with Morant and Runciman discussing the letter he would sign on behalf of the General Council. The Bishop's main anxiety was to secure the exclusion of Church of England members from the Conscience Clause. He was therefore immensely relieved when on the basis of his explanation that, 'if I were a Principal with 10 Nonconformist places filled out of 15 I should feel it a little difficult to allow 5 Church of England students to exempt themselves on conscientious grounds while the sixth was told to put his conscience into his pocket', they agreed to what the Bishop acknowledged as a great concession.²

The second important item of business transacted in Runciman's office was the hammering out of a letter to the Principals by Morant and the Bishop, explaining the agreement and emphasising

1 National Society, Whitelands Correspondence: letter from Canon Childs, 11.7.1908, and reply, 15.7.1908.

2 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter from the Bishop of St. Albans to Talbot Baines, 26.6.1908.

that there had been concessions on both sides. Runciman's Liberal and Nonconformist critics, anxious that he would go too far along the road of compromise, were content with the actual statement of availability of up to 50% of places, and the General Council had not insisted on Nonconformist students being counted as additional students. The Government had made a major concession in limiting the application of the Conscience Clause, and the General Council had agreed to the replacement on the list of registered candidates of those who had been rejected by colleges purely on denominational grounds.¹

After discussion of the amended Regulations 'line by line' the matter was finally resolved by an exchange of letters between Runciman and the Bishop, dated 24th and 25th June respectively, and a further letter from the Bishop to Runciman expressed pleasure that 'a satisfactory modus vivendi for the coming year had been reached'.² The Regulations were modified accordingly.

1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter from the Bishop of St. Albans to Principals, 26.6.1908.

2 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: 26.6.1908.

CHAPTER 5

THE WORKING OF THE MODUS VIVENDI

The best judgement on the confrontation is perhaps that of the Archbishops' Inspector: 'The State asked us, perhaps in somewhat peremptory terms, to extend our influence ... The circumstances no doubt were provocative of hysteria on both sides'.¹ In the working out of the agreement we see both the opportunity taken to extend Church influence, and if not hysteria, certainly a continuing resentment of Government intervention.

The matter was complicated by the fact that the agreement was for one year only but it was confidently expected that the friendliness of Runciman would make the working out of a long-term solution possible. The Principal of St. Mark's, however, in protesting against the modus vivendi made a wise reading of the situation. In his view, the colleges had sold the pass, and having done so 'we can never get anyone to believe now that it is impossible for us to accept the same percentage ... in another year ... we value life at any price to such an extent'.² And that indeed turned out to be the case when the Bishop of St. Albans took up the matter again with Runciman, on the advice of the Archbishop, in March 1909. The President revealed that he was under

1 National Society: Annual Report, 1908, p. 98.

2 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter to the Bishop of St. Albans, 29.6.1908.

political pressure to re-impose the 1907 Regulations, and that in those circumstances he could do no more than permit the modus vivendi to continue. The General Council had no alternative but to recommend the colleges to accept for another year.¹ It is noteworthy, however, that in so doing the Council followed the lead which had been given by the National Society Standing Committee a few days earlier.² In the following year Runciman announced the continuation of the modus vivendi without consulting the Bishop of St. Albans, and there the matter rested despite continued protest.³

Some colleges showed themselves out of sympathy with both the spirit and the letter of the compromise. Hardly was the ink dry on the agreement than Morant received a complaint about a candidate rejected at Winchester.⁴ Both Bristol and Battersea attempted to secure recognition of their Nonconformist students as additional to the number for which they were recognised, and Morant had to reiterate that it was 'one of the essential points agreed upon in our negotiations as one not to be pressed'.⁵ Truro

1 General Council: Minutes, 18.3.1909.

2 National Society: Annual Report, 1909, p. 16.

3 General Council: Minutes, 15.4.1910.

4 ED 24/493 Letter from L.S. Brock to R.L. Morant, 28.7.1908. Public Record Office.

5 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter to the Bishop of St. Albans, 29.6.1908.

discouraged Nonconformist candidates by failing to provide a hostel, and the attention drawn to this in the Cornwall County Council brought considerable unwelcome publicity to the position of the Church colleges in 1911.¹

Up to 1911 Chichester managed to avoid accepting any Nonconformists, except one 'by mistake', by the expedient of informing such applicants that there were only lodgings available. 'This information has always led to the withdrawal of applications'.² Bristol was equally successful in avoiding Nonconformists before 1911 by using an old Prospectus which indicated that the college provided only for churchwomen.³ In 1911 the old Prospectus ran out.

Saltley was reported as being in difficulty in 1911 and in danger of its grant being withdrawn.⁴ The probable reason for this was lack of accommodation. The college had felt so strongly that Church of England interests were being betrayed that in 1908 it had accepted Nonconformists only as day students.⁵ Alternatively, however, it could have been that the Nonconformist conscience had not been respected in the matter of religious instruction and worship.

1 General Council: Minutes, 9.3.1911.

2 National Society, Chichester Correspondence: General Council Enquiry, 1910.

3 National Society, Miscellaneous Correspondence: General Council Enquiry, 1911.

4 General Council: Minutes, 27.7.1911.

5 J. Osborne (ed.) (1950) Saltley College Centenary, 1850-1950, p. 46.

The Principal declared in 1910 that 'the presence of these students is not allowed to interfere in the remotest degree with the specific and definite Church attitude of the college'.¹

Murphy² points out that the 1908 Regulations were not difficult to evade since discrimination was difficult to establish, but the developments described above are clear indications that the central body on which all the colleges were represented did not have the authority to ensure that the compromise was honoured.

Many colleges would have supported the General Council in its periodic, almost ritual protests against the continuation of the modus vivendi. They have a routine air about them, and the expectedness of them must have blunted any impact. They have, too, about them something of the hysterical, in the insistence on the uncertainty and lack of stability caused by the Regulations, 'the threats of strife and struggle' from the Nonconformist incursion and the strain and anxiety imposed upon the colleges.³

Through it all Runciman remained helpful but firm. In confidence to Canon Dennis of Battersea he showed willingness to exercise his considerable dispensing powers if the college's difficulties in 1910 would be solved by an increase in the number of students for which the college was recognised, and in the

1 National Society, Miscellaneous Correspondence: General Council Enquiry, 1910.

2 J. Murphy (1971) Church State and Schools in Britain, 1800-1970, p. 99.

3 General Council: Minutes, 18.3.1909, and National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: Memorandum of the Executive Committee of General Council, 19.5.1911.

following year he indicated the Board's willingness to assist in the transfer of Nonconformists from one college to another, if there were excessive pressure on any one college, provided that such transfer could be arranged quietly.¹ Runciman was obviously personally well disposed, but could not risk drawing the attention of his more radical supporters to his conciliatory gestures.

The strain and anxiety were more in the minds of the officers of the Council than in the realities of college life in the new circumstances. The Secretary of the National Society and of the General Council at this time was the man who, when the modus vivendi had been reached, wrote to the Archbishop to make known his personal apprehension.² We see this apprehension in his request to three London colleges to let the Society know if anything in the nature of a breach of Trust seemed likely to arise under the Regulations.³ As the originator of the correspondence

1 General Council: Minutes, 24.5.1910, and 27.7.1911.

2 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter from Talbot Baines, undated 1908. Talbot Baines 'worked enthusiastically for the cause of Church Education'. After education at Rugby and Christ's College, Cambridge, he joined the staff of his father's newspaper, the Leeds Mercury, where he remained for twenty years before moving to London in 1897 to work for the Spectator and the Economist. Literary ability was one of the requirements of the National Society post, for the Secretary was also the editor of the Society's paper, the School Guardian. Talbot Baines must also have satisfied the requirement of 'an intimate knowledge of the details and general problems of Church educational work' to have secured appointment in 1906 from a very large field of candidates. J.A. Venn (1922-54) Alumni Cantabrigienses, Part II 1752-1900, and National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 10, 23.2.1906, p. 432.

3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 11, 5.5.1909, p. 286.

with the colleges on behalf of the General Council it is reasonable to see his hand in the drawing up of the annual enquiry forms sent out to colleges with the obvious intention of discovering ways in which the colleges, and the Church, were being disadvantaged under the working of the modus vivendi.¹

The determination to show that Church of England candidates were being adversely affected is seen in Talbot Baines' correspondence with Cheltenham. The college showed in 1910 that eight Nonconformists had been accepted in a total of 160 students, but that no accommodation had been provided specifically for them. The Secretary, realising that they were resident in the college itself, wished to know 'why it is held that those beds would not in ordinary circumstances have been occupied by members of the Church of England'. The college replied to the effect that for the past sixty-four years it had taken 'pious persons' of any denomination willing to accept the conditions of a Church of England college, and that under the terms of the modus vivendi they had in fact taken fewer Nonconformists than in previous years.²

-
- 1 The enquiry form included the following question: Has the college in consequence of the working of the modus vivendi any empty beds which should under ordinary circumstances have been occupied by members of the Church of England? National Society, Miscellaneous Correspondence: letter to colleges, 19.10.1909.
 - 2 National Society, Cheltenham Correspondence: letter to H.A. Bren, 7.3.1911, and reply, 8.3.1911.

More than one Principal found the campaign being waged from the National Society's office increasingly irritating. The replies of the Principal of St. Hild's to the annual enquiry are brief to the point of exasperation, and her general attitude is illustrated by her comment in 1913, 'Let sleeping dogs lie'.¹ In 1911 the representatives of Norwich and Hockerill deprecated as excessively strong the language used in the General Council's proposed representations to the Board of Education about the modus vivendi, and gave it as their view that the introduction of Nonconformists had in no way injured the Church colleges.²

That indeed must be the conclusion of any reasoned view of the situation. In 1908, 1,600 students were admitted to the thirty-one colleges, of whom only 168 were Nonconformists.³ Behind the Nonconformists' grievance was the demand for religious equality rather than religious toleration, but they showed no inclination to rush to take advantage of the newly granted equality. By 1913, the number had reached 197.⁴ But as the general recruitment position became more difficult some colleges were

1 National Society, St. Hild's Correspondence: General Council Enquiry 1912 and 1913.

2 General Council: Minutes, 29.5.1911.

3 National Society Correspondence: General Council Enquiry, 9.11.1908.

4 Returns for the intervening years were as follows: 1909: 147; 1910: 140; 1911: 174; 1912: 183. Bangor made no return in 1909, Winchester and York in 1911, Peterborough in 1912, Carmarthen and the Home and Colonial in 1913. National Society, Miscellaneous Correspondence: General Council Enquiries, 1909-13.

pleased to admit Nonconformists to residence. This occurred at Winchester in 1912 and 1913¹, at Peterborough from 1911², and even at Chichester in 1911 and 1912, the college excusing its violation of Trust Deeds with the excuse that Nonconformists were not displacing Church students.³

Nonconformists were in residence at Carmarthen, York and Bangor in 1912. Carmarthen, which perhaps not surprisingly was by 1913 receiving 50% of its applications from Nonconformists, requested the opinion of the General Council on the propriety of their coming into residence. The Executive took the unhelpful line that it was not in a position to advise, though the Principal of Battersea put into words what most members were probably thinking, namely that the action was justified in order to survive. The college was left to sort out its own dilemma.⁴ Some colleges, however, found that accommodation provided for Nonconformists was not being filled. Lincoln, with only five expected in 1913, gave up its second hostel and St. Gabriel's expected its hostel for twenty-one to be almost empty.⁵

-
- 1 National Society, Winchester Correspondence: General Council Enquiries 1912, 1913.
 - 2 National Society, Peterborough Correspondence: General Council Enquiry 1911.
 - 3 National Society, Chichester Correspondence: General Council Enquiries 1911, 1912.
 - 4 General Council: Minutes, 29.11.1912.
 - 5 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: Summary of Replies as to Supply of Candidates for Admission, 1913.

The replies from many of the colleges to the General Council's annual enquiry confirm Birrell's misgivings, for they indicate that for the most part the Nonconformists conformed to the religious provisions of the college, excusing themselves only from attending lectures on the Prayer Book. The Principal of Culham expressed what was probably the general situation. 'The average Nonconformist ... would feel himself aggrieved if any distinction was made between himself and other students. He does not wish to be exempted from Chapel or anything else that other students are engaged in'.¹ A former student of St. Hild's put it another way. 'Before the end of the first term I'm pretty sure they all came to Chapel like the rest of us'.²

The Archbishops' Inspector permitted himself the outspoken comment in 1910 that he was glad the Nonconformist students had been admitted, though many outside the colleges would not agree with him³, and the General Council by 1912 was prepared to admit that no harm had come to the colleges. In the following year it was suggested that in any representation to the Board of Education the protest

-
- 1 National Society, Culham Correspondence: General Council Enquiry, 1913.
 - 2 Letter to M.V. Boyd, dated 30.4.1974.
 - 3 National Society: Annual Report, 1910, p. 93. Archbishop Frederick Temple, after the insistence by the Board of Education on the admission of day students with a Conscience Clause to St. Gabriel's, Kennington in 1899, admitted that 'for his part he was not sorry that this condition was imposed'. E.G. Sandford (ed.) (1906) Memoirs of Frederick Temple, p. 318.

against the modus vivendi should be renewed but 'in an incidental manner'.¹

Morant's successor as Secretary to the Board, L.A. Selby-Bigge, in a paper to the President in 1912 made the perceptive comment that 'the Church of England grievance under the modus vivendi was always mainly a theoretical one'.² The Church was in effect arguing that its colleges, like those of the Roman Catholics, had an explicitly domestic purpose. But from the early nineteenth century the Church had insisted that its concern was with the nation's general education as well as with its own domestic task. There was a time, as the Durham Report points out³, when the two were held by many churchmen to be a single undifferentiated concern, because only within the framework of Scripture and doctrine and formularies of the Church could secular subjects be given 'value, beauty, glory and power'.⁴ But that could not be said to be the case in the first decade of the twentieth century. The cycle, Church School, Church College, Church School, had long ceased to be the general pattern. From shortly after 1870 colleges had accepted candidates from Board Schools and sent out trained teachers to serve

1 General Council: Minutes, 4.3.1913.

2 ED 24/1829 Deputation to the President of the Board of Education, 1912. Public Record Office.

3 The Fourth R (1970) The Report of the Commission on Religious Education in Schools, (Durham), p. 206.

4 National Society: Annual Report, 1869, p. 22.

a school system which was becoming increasingly inter-denominational.¹ With the acceptance of the condition for the opening of St. Gabriel's in 1899 and the admission of Nonconformists into hostels in the years before the 1907 Regulations, the colleges had shown that their function could no longer be described in terms explicitly domestic.

Indeed, the entry of Nonconformists into the colleges gave the Church the opportunity to begin to think openly about its colleges in other than denominational terms. Although the National Society at its Centenary celebrations in 1911 reiterated that its aim was definite, i.e. denominational, religious education², the Archbishop's Inspector saw the opportunity presented to the colleges to provide the opportunity of 'learning how to teach religion, even to those who do not accept all the truth as the Church believes it'.³

The role of the Church colleges in the exercise of this function became even more necessary after the withdrawal by Runciman, under pressure from his political supporters, of Chapter X of the 1909 Regulations which would have made it obligatory for all training colleges to provide courses of training to prepare students to give

1 A National Society Enquiry in 1902 showed that from the twenty-eight colleges which replied, 250 students were taking up appointments in Church Schools and 907 in Board Schools. A further 103 appointments remained to be made. National Society Correspondence: Enquiry, 1902.

2 National Society: Annual Report, 1911, p. 1.

3 National Society: Annual Report, 1910, p. 93.

religious instruction in school. The National Society itself may be said to have glimpsed the opportunity when it acknowledged that the preservation of the colleges was 'a matter absolutely vital to Religious Education, for the supply of religious teachers almost entirely depends on them'.¹ We are beginning to move away from that uncompromising declaration of denominationalism made some thirty years earlier, when it was held that 'the duty of a Christian teacher is best discharged when he has full liberty to inculcate doctrine which he believes to be true'.² The production of teachers 'trained under Church inspiration and in a Church atmosphere', which the National Society in 1907 was prepared to recognise as the denominational function of the colleges³, can stand as a definition of the role in the new situation, as both the colleges and the Church eventually came to realise.

-
- 1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 12, 31.7.1912, p. 64. An inquiry by H.M.I.s in 1909 showed that little if any practical work in the teaching of Scripture was done at Edgehill and Darlington and the other undenominational colleges 'kept clear of the subject in schools'. ED 24/494 Copies of Minutes by H.M.I.s, 1909. Public Record Office.
 - 2 National Society: Annual Report, 1880, p. 8.
 - 3 National Society: Annual Report, 1907, p. 23.

PART 3

THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND AFTERMATH

SECTION I

THE WAR YEARS

CHAPTER 1

ENLISTMENT AND CHURCH OF ENGLAND ATTITUDES

The challenge in 1914 was to the life of the nation as a whole, and therefore every activity within the nation in the period 1914-1918 had to be subordinated to the prior need to overcome that challenge. Thus the colleges could not escape their contribution and, sharing in the general mood of the time, did not seek to do so.

Britain until January 1916 relied on the voluntary system to maintain the armed services, and the activities of leading Anglican churchmen in recruiting and encouraging enlistment, as a duty to God as well as to the country, is well described by Wilkinson.¹ In 1914 the Church of England colleges for men needed no prompting. The ethos of the establishments had encouraged military training, and in many of them both staff and students were members of the Territorial Army. The colleges were thus immediately vulnerable.

When Osborne claims of Saltley that 'almost the whole college marched out of the main gate in August 1914' he is not exaggerating.² Their action was matched by the students of Bede College, who in August 1914 were almost all in Territorial camp

-
- 1 A. Wilkinson (1978) The Church of England and the First World War, pp. 32-56.
 - 2 J. Osborne (ed.) (1950) Saltley College Centenary, 1850-1950, p. 46.

and as a body were drafted, to form a Bede contingent, into the 8th Durham Light Infantry Battalion.¹ And at Winchester the clerical Principal, as Captain of the College Company, was with his students in camp in that fateful summer.²

These three colleges are among the list of eight with the highest proportion of students serving in 1914, of which all but one were Church of England colleges. The overall percentage of those in training who enlisted in 1914 was 32.6%, from the Voluntary colleges 51%, and from the eight listed below, considerably higher.

Enlistment of Students in Training, 1914

<u>College</u>	<u>In Training 1914</u>	<u>Enlisted 1914</u>	<u>%</u>
Battersea	150	140	93.3
Winchester	80	74	92.5
Bede	101	93	92.1
Sunderland	69	62	89.9
Culham	92	81	88.0
Exeter	117	102	87.2
Saltley	110	93	84.5
Chelsea	136	105	77.2

Source: Board of Education: Report, 1914-15, p. 76.

1 D. Webster (1973) Bede College, p. 50.

2 National Society, Winchester Correspondence: letter from E.G. Wainwright, Principal, 12.8.1914.

By contrast, the students at York did not belong to the Territorials as a body and the Principal in August 1914 knew of no student who had enlisted.¹ The students at Peterborough had not been permitted to join the Territorials², while at Cheltenham only one student in 1914 was a member.³ Carmarthen, however, lost almost all its second year, but there was a different response in May 1915 when the Principal expressed his regret that only 4 out of his 42 first-year students were willing to enlist at the end of term.⁴

The Board of Education, mindful of the need for teachers, was initially reluctant to encourage enlistment and sought to take no action which would give the impression that students in training 'were under greater obligation to undertake military service than was the case with other persons'.⁵ The issue of Circular 863 in August 1914 and Circular 878 in the following November, however, made known the details of arrangements to safeguard the future careers as teachers of those students who

-
- 1 National Society, York Correspondence: letter from H. Walker, 16.8.1914.
 - 2 National Society, Peterborough Correspondence: letter from T. Ward, 18.8.1914.
 - 3 National Society, Cheltenham Correspondence: letter from H.A. Bren, 12.8.1914.
 - 4 National Society, Carmarthen Correspondence: letter from A.W. Parry, 1.5.1915.
 - 5 Board of Education: Report, 1914-15, p. 71.

had enlisted, and enabled those in the second year of training to complete their course at Easter in order to enlist.

The Lord Derby recruitment scheme of October 1915 represented a position half-way between compulsion and voluntary enlistment. It involved a personal canvass of all men between the ages of 18 and 40, who were invited to attest their willingness to serve. They were medically examined, attested, and returned to their normal occupations until called for embodiment in age-groups.¹

The National Society was in close touch with the Board concerning the situation created by Lord Derby's enlistment propaganda, but was more enthusiastic in response. The Secretary was instructed to issue a circular on behalf of the Society, urging upon Principals the importance of inducing, if possible, all the students to offer for enlistment, 'thus crowning the very honourable position at present occupied by the Church Training Colleges as compared with other Training Colleges in the matter of service of the students with the King's forces'.²

The Board of Education recognised that the position by the autumn of 1915 had changed, and in October the President published an open letter urging the 'need for further sacrifice to meet the call for men'.³ It was hoped, however, that the actual embodiment

1 ED 24/1688 The Lord Derby Scheme. Public Record Office.

2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 11, 23.11.1915, p. 341.

3 Board of Education: Report, 1914-15, p. 7.

could be deferred for as long as possible. This, it was felt, would be in the best interests of the students and enhance the possibility of their returning to the profession after the war. But the over-riding concern of the Board was the economic one, that the financial arrangements of the colleges would not be dislocated if they were able to retain a substantial number of students to the end of the academic year.¹

The Board's concern on this count may explain the reserve in the language used in Circular 928, issued on 16th November, 1915, extending the concessions granted in the earlier Circulars. It expressed the Board's view that all male students 'should be permitted, if they so wish, to join the forces, without waiting to complete even the shortened course of training contemplated by Circular 878'.²

It was language to which the Assistant Secretary of the National Society, Richard Holland, who was handling training college affairs at this time, clearly took exception. Writing to the Archbishop of Canterbury, he regretted that the Board had not given more of a lead, but permitted any Principal inclined to discourage men from enlisting, to do so, though Holland had no fears that any of the Church of England Principals would come into that category.³ We do know, however, that Chester persuaded

1 ED 24/1688 The Lord Derby Scheme. Minute Papers 22.10.1915, 21.10.1915. Public Record Office.

2 Board of Education: Circular 928, 16.11.1915.

3 National Society Correspondence: 18.11.1915.

its men to remain until embodied under Lord Derby's scheme.¹ The Dean of Chester in fact made the suggestion to the Society that students should remain until July 1916 in order to complete the year. The Standing Committee agreed, however, that his letter should 'lie on the table'.²

The hard line taken by the Assistant Secretary extended to the view that those unwilling to volunteer should be sent out immediately to teach in school. From the beginning of the war he had been prepared almost to abandon college training and to send 'great numbers of college students into the schools for teaching practice under the supervision of College staffs',³ an attitude in marked contrast to that of the National Union of Teachers who, feeling in the autumn of 1914 that the diversion of educational effort had gone too far, continued to fight the battle for 'education as usual' throughout the war.⁴ The Board's view was that the State had an obligation to the students and could not treat them as Holland had suggested.⁵

-
- 1 National Society, York Correspondence: letter from H. Walker, Principal, 14.2.1916.
 - 2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 11, 2.2.1916, p. 345.
 - 3 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter to R.G. Mayor, Board of Education, 14.8.1914.
 - 4 A. Tropp (1957) The School Teachers, p. 208.
 - 5 ED 24/1688 The Lord Derby Scheme. Letter from L.A. Selby-Bigge to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 18.11.1915. Public Record Office.

The losses sustained in action were fuel to the fires of patriotism. The Archbishops' Inspector described Bede's losses in 1915 as 'a record magnificent and pathetic'.¹ And indeed both adjectives seem applicable in the light of Webster's description of the men going into action in April 1915, 'shouting the college war cries familiar to the Racecourse and Durham Regatta', an action in which the Company was virtually wiped out, with a third taken prisoner and a third dead or wounded.² The Principal of Culham in a Christmas letter in 1915 wrote of the 'holy memories of brothers who fell in the high cause of righteousness', and the second verse of a Culham hymn, specially composed after the war, echoes Webster's description:

We thank thee for our soldiers
Whose glory death hath sealed
Who sang the songs of Culham
In trench and battlefield.³

There was indeed irritation on the part of Holland because the Board of Education had 'proceeded by instalments' in its approach to the enlistment of students in training.⁴ The passing of the Military Service Acts and the introduction of conscription in 1916 was no doubt welcomed by him. The National Society had made no secret of its satisfaction and pride at the response of

1 National Society: Annual Report, 1915, p. 110.

2 D.E. Webster (1973) Bede College, p. 51.

3 A. Wilkinson (1978) The Church of England and the First World War, pp. 192, 157.

4 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: notes on letter from Lambeth Palace, 19.11.1915.

college students, and the Archbishops' Inspector had made it clear that he had not much to say for those who did not offer themselves.¹ Conscription ended any reservations students or college authorities may have had, and thereafter no men fit for service in the forces could be accepted for training.

1 National Society: Annual Report, 1915, p. 110.

CHAPTER 2

CONCENTRATION: THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND COLLEGES FOR MEN

1914

The foregoing chapter is essential to an understanding of the attitude of the Church of England authorities towards co-operation with the Board of Education in the matter of the disposition of the training colleges. It is co-operation as a patriotic duty, as part of the national war effort, and that duty has about it a religious element.

It is significant that the Board turned for co-operation, through the Archbishop of Canterbury, not to the General Council of the Church of England Training Colleges, but to the National Society. Here is the recognition of the centrality of the Society, and at the same time an indication that once the crisis which had given birth to the General Council in 1908 had subsided, that body showed little sign of life. Indeed there is no record of a meeting of the General Council or of its Executive in the period 1913-1923.

The initial steps were taken in August 1914, when the Board outlined a Concentration scheme at a special Whitehall conference, a scheme which included both L.E.A. and Voluntary colleges.¹

1 National Society Correspondence: letter to Archbishop of Canterbury, 16.11.1915.

The Church of England colleges were to be treated as a group and to make their own arrangements within the group, and the task of negotiation with the colleges and liaison with the Board was entrusted to the Assistant Secretary of the Society, Richard Holland. When he became Secretary of the Society in 1918, he had already been on the staff of the Society for thirty-five years, and he was described as possessing 'an easy and complete mastery of all branches of its work'.¹ The mastery of the college aspect of the Society's work was gained in the war years, and he remained the key figure in the administration of the Church training colleges, with an unrivalled knowledge, until he retired in 1936 at the age of 77, and after 53 years in the service of the Society.

His attitude towards the war and the enlistment of students we have already seen, but in his approach to his task we see also a passionate concern that the Church of England colleges should survive the war and be in a position to take up their task with renewed vigour. The only way to ensure this, in his view, was by co-operating with the Board of Education in its response to Treasury pressure for stringent economy, and at the same time husbanding the colleges' own meagre resources. That co-operation entailed an appeal for unity. 'It is vital to the security of our

1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 13, 6.12.1918, p. 27. Holland joined the staff of the Society in 1883, at the age of 24, as Corresponding Clerk responsible for the work of the grant department. He became Chief Clerk in 1901, Assistant Secretary in 1904 and was on the short-list for the post of Secretary in 1906.

Church colleges at this moment of stress that we should act together for the benefit of the whole body'.¹ It is, as we shall see², in his realisation that the benefit of the whole body required the establishment of machinery which would both create that unity and enable it to find expression, that Holland made his most valuable contribution to the future of the Church colleges.

The first phase of his work was comparatively easy and involved only four colleges. The immediate need was to provide for those students whose college buildings had been requisitioned, and to ensure that colleges whose students had enlisted were full. St. Mark's had been taken over for hospital purposes, and so the initial proposal was to send the remaining students from St. Mark's to Battersea, and those from Culham to Winchester. Holland expressed his confidence to the Board that, if no college were to suffer financially, he would be able to persuade the Church colleges as a whole to fall in with the scheme.³

His hand was therefore considerably strengthened by the publication on 15th August, 1914 of Circular 858, guaranteeing institutions against extraordinary loss or expenditure attributable to compliance with military requirements. In order to be able

-
- 1 National Society, Culham Correspondence: letter to A.R. Whitham, Principal, 14.8.1914.
 - 2 See Part 3, Section I, Chapter 4.
 - 3 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter to R.G. Mayor, 14.8.1914.

to claim, it was necessary to ensure that the Church colleges remaining open were worked with as full a complement of students as possible, that displaced staff were employed in other colleges, and that colleges deprived of their buildings were secured accommodation for their remaining students without renting or otherwise having to provide suitable buildings.¹

In the event, Winchester, with its Principal in Burford Camp, asked not to receive other students but to be temporarily closed, if its financial security could be guaranteed.² The students from both Culham and Winchester were therefore distributed among the other Church colleges, but the Board made it clear that the principle on which the Concentration scheme was operated was that colleges which had closed should retain their corporate identity, and students should remain on the books of their original college.³ All staff transferred to other colleges would continue to receive their full salaries, and those called up with the Territorials were to be similarly treated, with deductions in respect of their service pay.⁴

1 National Society: Annual Report, 1915, p. 10.

2 National Society, Winchester Correspondence: letter from E.G. Wainwright, 26.8.1914.

3 Board of Education: Report, 1914-15, p. 74.

4 National Society Correspondence: Draft Circular to Training Colleges, 28.8.1914.

1915

It was with the second phase of Concentration that Holland encountered resistance, and all his powers of tact, diplomacy and guile had to be brought into play. The inevitability of a second stage was apparent and Holland armed himself with an assurance from the Board in March 1915 that the Church colleges would be secured against financial loss.¹ This assurance was later embodied in Circular 895, dated 12th March, 1915, making possible the payment of a supplementary grant to enable an institution to meet necessary expenditure on maintenance, where the finances of a college were affected by a reduction of student numbers caused by the war.

The official request from the Archbishop of Canterbury, asking the National Society to prepare a further Concentration scheme, was received in July 1915², but Holland had clearly given his mind to this at an earlier date. The request of St. Mark's, to be permitted to provide temporary premises in 1915 in order to maintain the continuity of college life, had been dismissed out of hand by the National Society.³ The college felt that further distribution of its students would endanger that continuity, and similar fears had been expressed by the Principal of Winchester.

-
- 1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 11, 3.3.1915, p. 281.
 - 2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 11, 21.7.1915, p. 318.
 - 3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 11, 2.6.1915, p. 299.

He feared that the college would take years to recover if it were not allowed to reopen in 1915 and thought, as did St. Mark's, that other colleges should take their turn within the Concentration scheme.¹ The Bishop of Winchester had taken up the matter and Holland agreed that it was a sound principle, but insisted that the Board of Education regarded it as 'entirely out of the question'.²

Holland's tactics in dealing with colleges reluctant to come into the scheme are perhaps best exemplified in his correspondence with Cheltenham. There could, of course, be no question of compulsion either on the part of the Board or by the National Society. Any arrangement made had to be freely entered into and it was Holland's task to persuade.

In a series of letters in July 1915 we see the reassurance given to the college that they were free agents, the bald statement of the financial implications, and the subtle pressure. The college at first questioned the authority of the Society to act in the matter. In his reply Holland assured them that the Society was working with the authority of the Archbishop, and with the knowledge of the General Council, though there is no record of this, and that the Board itself required further Concentration.

1 National Society, Winchester Correspondence: letter dated 3.5.1915.

2 Ibid., letter to Bishop of Winchester, 3.7.1915.

His recommendation was that the men's section of the institution should be temporarily closed, but while the college was not unwilling to co-operate, it was not willing to fall in with Holland's suggestion without asking to be informed of the principles involved in making a scheme. Holland declined to clarify, on the ground that such clarification would involve communicating confidential information with regard to other colleges. He then raised the fear that if the Church of England colleges did not settle the matter among themselves they might be included in a general scheme and be absorbed by the local authority colleges. Then, on 21st July came what appears to have been the standard letter designed to bring recalcitrants to heel. The college was assured that the negotiations with the Board were tentative and conditional. The position of no college had been compromised, Concentration was a matter of arrangement and there was no need for a particular college to come into the scheme if it could carry on without a grant towards loss arising from war conditions. There would of course be no supplementary grant to those colleges which chose not to come into the scheme.¹ The college at the end of July was still holding out, regretting that it had had no opportunity to state its case against closure or of learning the grounds for the action taken. It decided to appeal to the Board for a special grant. The action led to a meeting early in August of Holland and the college representatives with officials of the

1 National Society, Cheltenham Correspondence: letters dated 7.7.1915 to 27.7.1915.

Board, and he was called upon to justify his choice. The outcome was that the college authorities 'were made to see at last that it was in their interest to come into the scheme'.¹

We do not know what arguments were used by Holland. The dispersal of Cheltenham men made little educational sense, for that meant dispersal of staff too, thus affecting the neighbouring institution for women, with whom teaching was shared. If financial considerations were uppermost, then in that year dispersal was not imperative, for the college was only 40 men short, so that the combined institution, with 280 instead of 320 students, could probably have survived without the supplementary grant, as did the local authority mixed colleges.²

Perhaps, however, Holland was taking the longer term view. Winchester had expressed its conviction that the college could survive financially if it were allowed to re-open in 1915, but was persuaded by Holland's argument that, while survival for perhaps one year was possible, that would swallow up valuable resources needed to put the college on its feet again after the war, when all the difficulties which had confronted the Church of England men's colleges in 1914 would return in greater measure.³

1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter to Bishop of Wakefield, 20.1.1916.

2 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter from H.A. Bren, Principal of Cheltenham, 28.7.1915.

3 National Society, Winchester Correspondence: letter from R.G. Crawford, Treasurer, 11.7.1915, and reply, 13.7.1915.

The nature of Holland's reasoning remains in doubt, however, when we see the argument with which he was apparently persuaded to change his original plan to close Bede. The college's case was that the reduction of numbers to 40 for 1915 was due to the patriotism of its students. 'No college, in proportion to its numbers, has made a better response to the Call of the Country for military service, and no college has as yet paid such a heavy price for its loyalty'.¹ The college thus maintained that it had a very special claim to be kept open. Holland may have been persuaded by the plea that the 26 college students wounded in battle would, on their return home, find themselves deprived of 'a much needed home'. This is likely to have carried more weight with him than the fear expressed that, as almost 90% of college applicants were from Durham or the North, the closure of the college would direct candidates to local authority colleges in the area², for in his original proposal York was to remain open to take candidates from the North. Holland, however, was definite in his reply that 'Bede shall not be closed under Concentration if I can in any way arrange it'.³

-
- 1 National Society, Bede Correspondence: letter from D. Jones, 23.7.1915. The Saltley College Rifle Company came to an end in July 1916 when almost all were casualties at Mailly Mailly, (see J. Osborne (ed.) (1950) Saltley College Centenary, 1850-1950, p. 129) and the Exeter students who were members of the Second Devons were among the first 'over the top' at the Battle of the Somme and were virtually wiped out. (See C.R. Tattersfield (1978) St. Luke's College, 1839-1978, p. 16).
 - 2 National Society, Bede Correspondence: letter from D. Jones, 23.7.1915.
 - 3 Ibid., letter dated 24.7.1915.

On 30th July, 1915, the Board of Education called a conference with the authorities of training colleges admitting men, to discuss the second phase of Concentration. A preliminary meeting of Church of England representatives took place the day before. Any criticism or debate was effectively stifled by the reading of a letter from the Archbishop, pointing out that both he and the Archbishop of York were in favour of the proposals to be put before the Board and thought that 'this fact should be helpful both to negotiators and to those who wished the plan to be other than it is'.¹ The resolution that Holland should be the only spokesman of the colleges at the conference on the following day was carried nem. con. The Cheltenham representatives, still at this time unpersuaded, did not vote on the matter but indicated that although matters had still not been sufficiently explained to them they would not contest their inclusion in the Concentration scheme at the conference itself.²

Holland's plan, put forward for acceptance and approved by the Board, was that Winchester, St. Mark's and Culham should remain closed, and be joined by Cheltenham, Peterborough and Exeter. Students were to be distributed to the remaining six colleges.³ The closed colleges were to preserve their identity and keep their accounts as though working normally. They were to pay a host college

-
- 1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter dated 29.7.1915.
 - 2 Ibid., letter from Talbot Baines to Archbishop of Canterbury, 30.7.1915.
 - 3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 11, 3.11.1915, p. 331.

a fixed sum per student, to be arranged with the National Society but subject to the approval of the Board.¹

The preservation of identity was perhaps not helped by the dispersal of the different 'years' of students to different colleges, no doubt to make the most efficient use of teaching staff. It is difficult to see why Peterborough was selected for closure, unless on the ground that with accommodation for only fifty-two it was the smallest college. It expected to have almost a full complement in 1915 and thus expressed surprise at being selected. The Principal showed a touching concern for the fate of his students in pleading that they should not be sent to a London college, for they were 'exceptionally backward' even when judged by the general standard of Peterborough students.² It is not recorded what the receiving college, Bede, thought of their acquisition.

It is clear that the colleges affected by closure came into line with the utmost reluctance, faced with an inability to survive in the longer term outside the Concentration scheme. Their misgivings, however, must have been sharpened by the awareness, gained at the conference with the Board, of the 'confusion and heart-burnings in connection with the concentration of the Municipal Training Colleges'.³ The Secretary of the Board was later to admit,

-
- 1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: Draft of letter to Colleges, 10.8.1915.
 - 2 National Society, Peterborough Correspondence: letter from T. Ward, Principal, 28.7.1915.
 - 3 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter to Archbishop of Canterbury, 30.7.1915.

in a letter to the Society, that the Concentration scheme had not been found workable with the L.E.A. colleges. Several, taking both men and women, had been willing to carry on without asking for supplementary grant, and they could not have been compelled to combine with other colleges. The Board was anxious to reassure the Society that although the burden of Concentration had fallen mainly on the Church colleges, 'there has been no disposition on our part to differentiate in favour of the other colleges or to let them off more easily'.¹ The official line, however, was that schemes had been considered, but that the savings would not have been high enough to justify the dislocation or inconvenience.²

In the event, therefore, the only non-Church Concentration which took place was in London. The college at Moorfields, for women, was closed, together with the men's college at Islington. Clapham and Fulham were amalgamated at the recently opened Furzedown and the Elementary Training Department of King's College was transferred to the London Day Training College.³ The gratitude of the Board to the Society for what the Church colleges had done was such as to receive special mention in the Annual Report for 1914-15.

1 National Society Correspondence: letter from L.A. Selby-Bigge, 15.9.1915.

2 Board of Education: Report, 1914-15, p. 75.

3 Ibid., p. 74.

Up to this point the co-operation of the Church, at an official level, with the policy of the Board had been a willing co-operation in the national interest. But the knowledge that the Board was not strong enough to limit the number of colleges permitted to remain open and therefore, because of the L.E.A. opposition, was unable to implement the Concentration scheme outlined at the August 1914 conference, caused serious misgivings about future co-operation. The National Society's views were conveyed in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in November 1915, on the day of the publication of Circular 928 permitting all students to enlist. The Society was not willing to see all Church colleges closed while L.E.A. colleges remained open. However, the national need was uppermost and it was their view that the men were wanted either in the army or, if medically unfit, in the schools. The Society was therefore in favour of all the colleges for men being treated alike, and all being closed.¹

1916

The coming of conscription in January 1916 and the possible consequences of further Concentration were such as thoroughly to alarm the Bishop of Wakefield, who had succeeded the Bishop of St. Albans as Chairman of the General Council of the Church of England Training Colleges in 1912. He feared that if the publicly managed

1 National Society Correspondence: letter from Talbot Baines to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 16.11.1915.

colleges refused to Concentrate at all then compliance by the Church colleges could easily lead to permanent closure of some of them. The situation was such that he wanted a meeting of the Executive of the General Council, 'as we are taking important steps without their knowledge'.¹

Holland's reply is significant, not only in emphasising how money was 'the compelling force at the back of the situation' but in showing how much he saw that it was to be a crucial factor in the post-war years, a realisation which reinforced his willingness to continue to co-operate with the Board. He was not averse to a meeting of the Executive as Wakefield had suggested, but stressed that it was utterly impossible for the Executive to negotiate a Concentration scheme. It had no funds at its disposal, and therefore no power in the matter, and any resolution of the Executive touching on finance could not possibly bind the National Society.²

Here is the crux of the matter, for it was of course because of the financial relationship of the Society with the colleges that the Board had turned to it in 1914. Apart from Tottenham, supported by S.P.C.K., and Cheltenham, which had cut itself off from National Society grants by refusal to take the Religious Knowledge examinations, all the other colleges looked to the Society

1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter dated 8.1.1916.

2 Ibid., letter dated 20.1.1916.

for the bulk of their support other than from Government grants and fees. Payment of the Society's grants to individual colleges was continued at their usual level throughout the war, even though the conditions usually attached to the grants could not in all cases be fulfilled.¹ Holland made the point, however, that the Society could not provide more money, and it would be folly for colleges to use their own resources in order to keep running during the war. There would be no supplementary grants when the war was over, so the colleges, he held, should take full advantage of them while they could. The Church would not be asked to close down all its colleges, he was obviously confident enough of his relationship with the Board to claim that, but it would be 'better to do even this in return for a guarantee against all financial loss while the war lasts, rather than spend one penny to keep the colleges open during the war'.²

As for Wakefield's concern that steps were being taken without the knowledge of the General Council, Holland pointed out that he had acted under the authority of the two Archbishops and the National Society and that the Concentration scheme was a voluntary arrangement. In the only case of difficulty, Cheltenham, there had been no compulsion. Any new scheme would be arranged in the same way as the two previous schemes, and therefore the General

1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 11, 3.2.1915, p. 276.

2 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter to Bishop of Wakefield, 20.1.1916.

Council would have no force behind it if it were to argue that the Society had been taking important steps without its knowledge.¹

However positive the promise of financial salvation, no college wished to be closed. The jockeying for position began early. At the end of 1915 the Archbishop of York wrote to Holland pressing the claim of York to be kept open as the natural centre for Concentration in the North, on the grounds both of its antiquity and of the state of its buildings, equipment and facilities.² Bede saw the possibility of remaining open if it were permitted to admit Nonconformists into the main buildings of the college, not seeing this as in any way contrary to the intentions of the Founders, in the existing circumstances.³ Holland's mind, however, was not at that time running in the direction of either of these colleges. There was apparently no question that Battersea should remain open, and in the initial stages of negotiation Holland hoped that one other would be permitted. Saltley was considered a possibility, but this did not meet with York's approval. The Archbishop continued to press his case, reminding the Society 'how sensitive people are sometimes in the North East'.⁴ Further pressure was applied by the Principal of York, who communicated the results of

1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter to Bishop of Wakefield, 20.1.1916.

2 National Society, York Correspondence: letter dated 15.12.1915.

3 National Society, Bede Correspondence: letter from A.H. Patterson, Hon. Secretary, 13.11.1915.

4 National Society, York Correspondence: letter dated 29.6.1916.

conversations with H.M.I.s from which had emerged the possibility of York remaining open with students from the L.E.A. colleges at Hull and Dudley.¹

This communication from the Principal of York may have led to Holland's letter to L.E.A. colleges shortly afterwards, offering to take men into the Church colleges. This was an unprecedented move, and a measure of his anxiety to retain more than one college. The Municipal colleges were assured that the scheme would conserve in all possible ways the individuality of the several colleges, and that the students would be received with full freedom of religious instruction and observance.² It was a desperate attempt, which did, however, produce a response, and in 1916 students from both Manchester and Hull joined the Church college students at Battersea.³

Holland thought enough about the pressures being put on him, to cause him to write to Bede to assure them that in whatever proposals he put to the Board he would be guided, as in the two previous years, only by considerations of what was best for the students and of what was conducive to economy, and 'without regard to 'influence' of any kind'.⁴ Such was Holland's sensitivity towards the situation that at this stage he felt it necessary to

1 National Society, York Correspondence: letter dated 4.7.1916.

2 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter dated 18.6.1916.

3 National Society: Annual Report, 1917, p. 15.

4 National Society, Bede Correspondence: letter to D. Jones, 18.7.1916.

write to the Principals to seek their approval of the suggestion of York as the second college to be retained. He admitted that the total number from all the colleges, 160, would fill only Battersea, but the case for a second college was that it would make the provision of suitable courses considerably easier.¹

Holland must have received sufficient support from the colleges for him to put the proposal to the Board, but all the negotiation was set at nought by the Board's decision that the cost of supplementary grant would be reduced by running one college instead of two, and hence Concentration was to be on Battersea alone.² To allay the anticipated alarm at the closure of eleven out of twelve Church colleges, the National Society issued a statement to the Press emphasising that the closure applied only to the scholastic use of the buildings. The students at Battersea would retain membership of the college to which they had been admitted, and colleges would continue to receive applications for 1917. The colleges retained their original staffs, though many not on active service were currently doing other, temporary work until the end of the war brought about the reopening of the colleges.³

1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter dated 11.8.1916.

2 Ibid., letter to Principals, 21.8.1916.

3 Ibid., letter from Talbot Baines, 27.9.1916.

What was achieved by the Concentration scheme? It is clear that by 1914 the Church colleges as a whole were entering on a new stage of existence, as the increased overall provision of teacher-training places made the prospects of future competition severe. It would not be an exaggeration to say that in 1914 it looked as if the writing was on the wall for the Church of England men's colleges. The war gave a breathing space and an opportunity for thought to be given as to how the situation was to be redeemed in the post-war years. There is no doubt, also, that the willingness of Holland to co-operate with the Board, and the confidence placed in him by its officials, put the National Society and the Church colleges in good standing with the Board and augured well for future relationships. The Board expressed its thanks both publicly and privately, and especially for the services of Mr. Holland¹, and he himself felt that the reason why the Board had dealt generously with all the cases where financial hardship had been caused by the war was that the Board recognised that the Church colleges had done their utmost.² It was clearly his hope, and one of the ends to which he had been working, that that generosity, at least of attitude, would be continued in the years after the conflict.

1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter dated 2.9.1915.

2 National Society, Bede Correspondence: letter to D. Jones, 17.8.1916.

CHAPTER 3

OTHER COLLEGES IN THE WAR YEARS

The loss of students to the Services affected both the Roman Catholic college at Hammersmith and the Methodist college at Westminster. The effect was not perhaps so dramatic as in the case of their Anglican counterparts, but for the colleges the consequences were equally serious.

The Principal of Westminster regretted that the college had no connection with a Territorial unit, but he wrote to all former students and held a series of meetings at the college. As a result of his 'untiring efforts' the Wesleyan Education Committee was able to express its great satisfaction that 227 old students had enlisted in 1914.¹ The second-year students were given every encouragement to complete their course at Easter 1915, in accordance with Circular 878, and in the following year the Report spoke of 'the irresistible appeal to students' of the call to National Service.²

1 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1914-15, p. 11.

2 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1915-16, p. 21. We meet an entirely different mood at the undenominational Borough Road where the Committee, while leaving individuals free to make up their own minds, felt it proper to counsel the students that they were already committed to a vital service to their country, not lightly to be abandoned. See E.L. Hewlett (1932) 'The Work of the British and Foreign School Society in the Training of Teachers', unpublished thesis, p. 304.

The Committee were agreed that the continuity of the life of the college should not be broken except under direst necessity. The contribution of the Principal, H.B. Workman, to the preservation of that continuity was the publication of the Westminster College War Bulletin, by means of which he kept in touch with old students throughout the war.¹ The college wished to remain in London, holding that the educational advantages of being in the centre outweighed anything that the country could offer.

In 1915, however, the building was taken over for military purposes and the students were moved to the Methodist Theological College at Richmond. There, after the introduction of conscription in 1916, they were joined by the remaining students of Borough Road.² Expenses were shared with the British and Foreign School Society, and by 1917 the college had been reduced to four staff, including two Principals, and twenty-one students, ten of whom were from Borough Road.³

It is noteworthy that the Principal of Westminster should feel that the immediate concerns of the college were not so important as the conservation of the high academic position attained by the college before the war.⁴ From the time of his

1 F.C. Pritchard (1951) The Story of Westminster College, 1851-1951, p. 120.

2 Board of Education: Report, 1915-16, p. 61.

3 G.F. Bartle (1976) A History of Borough Road College, p. 66.

4 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1916-17, p. 4.

appointment in 1903 he had set out in a single-minded pursuit of that position, a process which culminated in 1930 when the college offered a four-year degree course to all entrants. The war was regarded as an interruption of that pursuit.

Westminster remained at Richmond until 1920. Nine hundred and six members of the college served in the forces and it was considered appropriate to devote 60 pages of the Annual Report of 1919-20 to the obituaries of 102 who were killed. The award of V.C.s to two members of the college was hailed by the Education Committee as 'a record unique in the colleges of the country'.¹

The Reports of the Catholic Education Council are free of those enthusiastic statements of support for the war which are found in Anglican and Methodist sources. Whether the muted approach was reflected in the college at Hammersmith it is not possible to say. Unlike Westminster, the college remained in London. It was recognised that there could be no amalgamation with other colleges, and so it remained, with declining numbers of students as the war progressed. There were 74 in 1916, and 42 in 1917. The 1918 session opened with only 12 students but closed with 65. The college was of course secured against financial loss, by receipt of a supplementary grant.²

1 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1916-17, p. 87.

2 Catholic Education Council: Reports, 1916-1918.

By comparison with the men's colleges, those for women were little affected by the war. This is not to say that they were unaffected, and in the case of two of the Church of England colleges there was physical disruption of their work. St. Gabriel's, Kennington was taken over for hospital purposes, and as part of the 1914 Concentration scheme the decision was taken to transfer the residential students to the vacated Culham college. There was an attempt to secure the transfer of the 28 St. Gabriel's hostel students to the Home and Colonial College¹, but the latter was unable to oblige and they were eventually accommodated by the London County Council college at Clapham.²

The necessity for the closure of an annexe at Warrington is less easy to understand. It was at Holland's suggestion that the college agreed to close Orford Hall, where it offered a one-year course for Certificated teachers, with no religious restriction on entry. The Principal's protestations that it was 'the only place of its kind' fell on deaf ears and Holland indicated that if the college did not make the offer the Board 'would make the suggestion (or probably requirement)'.³ There is no apparent justification for such a statement but Holland's pursuit of economy would have been influenced by the fact that, at the time of writing, only 10 of the

1 National Society, Home and Colonial Correspondence: letter to D.J. Thomas, Principal, 24.8.1914.

2 National Society Correspondence: Draft Circular to Colleges, 28.8.1914.

3 National Society, St. Katharine's Liverpool Correspondence: letter from Morley Stephenson, 22.7.1915, and reply, 27.7.1915.

30 available places for the next academic year had been filled, while his anxiety that the colleges should contribute to the war effort in every possible way would have persuaded him of the value of the teachers remaining in school and postponing further training.

All the women's colleges, however, felt the results of financial stringency, which meant that development was at a standstill. At Hockerill not even small repairs were carried out, the Principal declaring in 1916, 'Everything must be subordinated to the stupendous effort to which the Empire is now committed'.¹ Sharply rising costs as a result of war conditions led the Council of Principals of Church of England Training Colleges, at one of its rare meetings during the war, to write to the General Council, urging them to take measures to protect the future of the Church colleges.²

The Roman Catholic colleges were moved by the same problem to urge the Board of Education to make payment of supplementary grant available to all colleges, in view of the increased cost of maintenance.³ Mount Pleasant, particularly, was in difficulties, for the Mother House of the Order was at Namur in Belgium and in the war situation there was no income from that source. But the war period also coincided with the attempt made by the Catholic

1 G.A. Wood (1938) History of Hockerill Training College, p. 70.

2 Council of Principals: Minutes, 4.1.1916.

3 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1917, p. 24.

Education Council to decrease the amount of financial support granted to the colleges, because of other demands on its slender resources. The Council agreed to help Mount Pleasant in its particular difficulty but then resolved in 1916 that from July 1918 they would make no regular grants to colleges, but grants only for specific purposes.¹ Thus the colleges had to raise their fees, to £10 at Hammersmith in 1915, to £20 in the women's colleges in 1916, and by a further £5 in 1917. The complaint of St. Mary's College in Newcastle that the problem of ever-increasing prices was 'a problem which it seems at present impossible to solve' would have been echoed in all the colleges.²

Dent seems to suggest that the 'conspiracy of silence' in contemporary documents about academic and professional standards in the colleges during the war is an indication that there was in fact some deterioration.³ This silence, which is borne out by the published college histories, most of which echo Zebedee's assertion about Lincoln, that the college was not touched by the war⁴, may equally well be taken as an indication that things went on very much as before.

1 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1916, p. 19.

2 Ibid., p. 44.

3 H.C. Dent (1975) The Training of Teachers in England and Wales, 1800-1975, p. 90.

4 D.H.J. Zebedee (1962) Lincoln Training College, 1862-1962, p. 79.

The students at Derby spent much time in gardening, knitting and filling in 30,000 National Registration forms, but this was clearly spare time activity in which most of the women's colleges would have participated.¹ In an area particularly affected by enemy activity, Hull, it is considered noteworthy that on one occasion such activity made it impossible to hold the practical teaching examination at the Roman Catholic college at the appointed time.² At another Roman Catholic college, Salford, which had moved to Sedgley Park, Prestwich, in 1906, excursions for geographical and scientific purposes had to be abandoned because of high railway fares.³ Such deprivation would have detracted from the interest of the work, but one could not claim that this affected the course as a whole in anything but a minor way. The last three published Reports of the Archbishops' Inspector, 1914-1916, a man usually not slow to reveal shortcomings, contain no comments which would indicate that there was any deterioration in the work of the Church of England colleges he had visited.

The clearest picture of normality emerges from the Methodist college at Southlands, which continued in London throughout the war, with a full complement of students. Life went on so much

-
- 1 M. Dobson (1951) The First Hundred Years of the Diocesan Training College, Derby, p. 36.
 - 2 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1916, p. 42.
 - 3 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1918, p. 36.

as usual that, says Williams, students continued to visit Paris in their third year of study.¹

It would be idle to pretend, however, that any college was not touched by the war. The problems and difficulties, of finance, buildings, equipment and facilities which most Church colleges had encountered were in no way lessened in the four-year period of hostilities, but rather exacerbated. It is to the credit of Mr. Holland that from his experience of negotiating with the Church of England colleges and, on their behalf, with the Board of Education, he was able to grasp the severity of those problems facing the Anglican colleges and from his unique vantage point was able, as we shall see, to point the way to a possible solution.

1 E. Williams (1972) The History of Southlands College, 1872-1972, p. 52.

CHAPTER 4

THE WAKEFIELD COMMISSION

The Preliminaries

As we have seen, Mr. Holland's work in connection with the Concentration scheme was always with an eye to the future. The insight which he gained into the Church of England colleges, and the intimate knowledge of their working, led him to see early on that the future of the colleges depended on the emergence of some form of central direction and policy. Writing to the Treasurer of Winchester in July 1915, he spoke of the need to devise plans for securing stronger financial support from the Church as a whole than the colleges had previously enjoyed, and to have that increased support available as soon as possible after the war.¹

The matter continued to exercise his mind, and in January 1916 Holland communicated to the Archbishop of Canterbury the fruits of his reflection on the future of the Church colleges, in a letter important not only for what it contained, showing Holland's perspicacity in seeing that the crisis of the war had come as a help rather than a hindrance to the men's colleges, but also for that to which it led. The war had come as a help because it had postponed the dangers arising from lack of students, defects in buildings and general financial weakness, which had seemed

1 National Society, Winchester Correspondence: letter to R.H. Crawford, 13.7.1915.

particularly threatening before the summer of 1914, and the colleges would escape all financial loss due to the war itself.

But, insisted Holland, the difficulties had only been postponed, and would inevitably come up again after the war, and some of the difficulties, particularly of the diocesan colleges, were, in his view, much more serious than the authorities of the colleges or even the Standing Committee of the National Society realised. Those difficulties could only be solved, and the colleges put in a state of readiness to compete, if the Church increased the amount of its financial support tenfold. The National Society contributed £6,000 per annum to the colleges, £2,300 of which went to the diocesan colleges, but that contribution, claimed Holland, was not adequately matched by income from diocesan sources. Without a radical improvement in support there was no way in which twelve colleges for men could be supported after the war. This assertion was, of course, contrary to everything that was being said publicly at the time, as negotiations were about to get under way for the third phase of Concentration.

Holland grasped the nettle at the heart of the problem and urged that 'the time has come when the Training College question must be dealt with as a whole, and the colleges must be organised on a general rather than a diocesan basis'. As an essential preliminary he made the suggestion that a Commission, to include an architect, should carry out a visit of inspection of the men's colleges.¹

1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter to Archbishop of Canterbury, 5.1.1916.

The Archbishop was quick to respond and to indicate that he wished to discuss the possibility of a Commission with other Bishops. Holland was approached by the Bishop of Wakefield for information to enable him to compile a circular to be sent to the Bishops, and in order to show the level of support needed for the colleges, Holland included in his submission an unfavourable comparison between the Church colleges and L.E.A. colleges in the matter of payments to staff, expenditure on equipment and reliance on fee income. To bring Church college expenditure up to the same level an additional £20,000 per annum would be needed. In most of the L.E.A. colleges, claimed Holland, students were not required to pay fees, whereas the Church colleges were heavily dependent on income from that source. That dependence would have to be reduced in the future or bursaries provided. What was clear was that alternative sources of income were essential.¹ The comparison was realistic, but sufficiently alarming for the Bishop of Wakefield to decide not to communicate its substance.

Early in February 1916 the Archbishop invited the National Society Standing Committee to nominate the members of a small travelling Commission, to serve under the Bishop of Wakefield. We cannot claim that the setting up of an enquiry was an indication of a general realisation that the colleges were strategically vital for the Church's work in education, but it was the first official

1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter to Bishop of Wakefield, 18.1.1916.

recognition of the colleges' importance. The terms of reference proposed by the Archbishop were exactly those which had been suggested by Holland. The Commission was to report on buildings, the general financial position, and prospects for recruitment, of each of the men's colleges.¹ The Commission was to be small, because of the expense, but the Society was willing to undertake that expense because it saw the Commission's activity as having a bearing on the future use of its resources.²

If we are to seek for the reason for the Society's enthusiasm for the enquiry, we will find it in the Society's sensitivity to its own financial commitments at this time. That sensitivity had been heightened by the setting up by the Church in 1914 of a Central Board of Finance, which had issued an appeal, interrupted by the war, for £5,000,000 to establish a Central Church Fund.³

The relationship of the Society to that body, and the possible effect of its work on the funds of the Society, was a matter of considerable concern. It was also exercising the Central Board, which sought the Society's views. The Society made the case that whatever responsibilities the Central Board assumed, it would have to take into account the special work and national appeal of the Society as 'the great central reservoir of Church benefactions

-
- 1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 11, 2.2.1916, p. 345.
 - 2 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter from Talbot Baines to Archbishop of Canterbury, 11.2.1916.
 - 3 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1920, p. 24.

applicable to the aid of local and other effort in connection with religious education'.¹ The Society was asserting its indispensability.

There was, however, bound to be an overlap of interest and it is this overlap which makes for ambivalence in the Society's attitude to the Central Board at this time. On the one hand it hoped that the increased diocesan financial efficiency, which was expected to result from the setting up of the Central Board, would improve the position of the Society, but at the same time it feared that there would in fact be a diversion of funds to diocesan purposes. On the other hand, it saw in the Central Board a source of hope for the training colleges, a source of that additional funding which was required and which it was not within the Society's means to provide.

The Commission had a total membership of seven, including the sub-Treasurer of the National Society, the Society's architect, at the suggestion of Mr. Holland, and, on the insistence of the Bishop of Wakefield and the Secretary of the Society, Mr. Holland himself. Again we have to note that both the General Council and the Council of Principals were left out of account. They were not officially consulted, but there was an awareness by the Society that the Commission would be treading a delicate path, and it was therefore thought advisable that it should be the Archbishop's task to notify the colleges of their impending visit.²

1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 11, 21.7.1915, p. 318.

2 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter from Talbot Baines to Archbishop of Canterbury, 11.2.1916.

The Commission began its work in February. A visit to each college by the architect, lasting two or three days, preceded that of other members of the Commission, armed with his survey, which lasted for no more than one day. In June the important step was taken of asking the Commission to extend its visitation to include the colleges for women, so that an overall picture could be gained. It was not therefore until November that the Commission was ready to present its Report.¹

The Report

It is important for an understanding of the Report to know that Mr. Holland was appointed Secretary of the Commission, conducted all the correspondence, made all arrangements, drafted the main part of the document and, in the words of his fellow Commissioners, 'contributed largely to whatever value our Report may have for the Training Colleges and the Church'.² The Report may thus be regarded as Holland's letter to the Archbishop, which prompted the enquiry, writ large. In fact the Chairman, the architect and Holland were, because of the expense, the only members of the Commission to visit every college, and the general findings are in accord with Holland's previous misgivings.

1 Training College Commission (1916) Report.

2 Ibid., p. 26.

In the forefront of the minds of the Commissioners is the need for the colleges to be in a position to compete, both for staff and students, after the war. The reality of that competition is made clear. In 1905 the recognised accommodation in Church of England colleges was for 3,755 students, and places in other institutions totalled 5,232. In 1915 the corresponding figures were 3,766 and 9,076, of which 3,683 were in L.E.A. colleges which, by the provision of hostels, were being transformed into residential training colleges, thus adding to their appeal.¹

Hence the concern over the pay and pensions of college staffs. While the payment made to Principals compared favourably with that of other Principals, the same could not be said of other staff. The average amount per student paid in salaries in the Church of England colleges was £14.9.0., but to be on a level with salaries paid in other colleges it ought to have been £25.1.0.² As for pensions, in only nine colleges was there a general scheme, and some of the schemes were not satisfactory, and in thirteen others some amount was paid out of current account to past members of staff.³ There was no provision at York, Chester, Norwich, Chichester, or, surprisingly, Whitelands. There was clearly need for a general scheme and for financial arrangements

1 Training College Commission (1916) Report, p. 6.

2 Ibid., p. 19.

3 Ibid., pp. 20-21.

which would attract good teachers to a career in the Church colleges. However, income from fees, which should have been used to boost salaries, was being diverted to capital expenditure on buildings or payment of rents. Income for this purpose from voluntary subscriptions amounted to less than 4% of total income, and Government grants could not be so used.¹

The inspection of the buildings and the general equipment of the colleges showed that the situation was better than might have been expected, in view of the fact that the Church colleges had been pioneer institutions, and the demands of the Gothic style of building, characteristic of the nineteenth-century colleges, 'were more often considered than the use to which the building was to be put'.² In the case of only three colleges was a radical solution suggested. The removal to a new site was suggested for Warrington, 'on economic, hygienic and general grounds', and for Whitelands, in the light of the Board of Education's view that the college had outgrown its accommodation in both educational and social terms. For Peterborough, with very poor buildings, and with recognised accommodation for only 52 and no prospect of being permitted to take additional students, the expense of building a new college would not, in the Commission's view, be justified.³

1 Training College Commission (1916) Report, p. 22.

2 Training College Commission (1916) Report, Appendix III, General Report on Buildings, p. 59.

3 Training College Commission (1916) Report, p. 7.

For the rest, the existing defects, though serious, could be put right if sufficient funds were available. The architect's comments ranged from a commendation of St. Hild's, 'Among the Church Training Colleges it stands certainly in the front rank', to condemnation of Bede, as being 'in some important particulars deficient in design and equipment for its purpose'.¹ In nearly every college, however, more teaching space was needed, more study rooms for small groups, better laboratories and improved lighting and ventilation.²

The Commission paid considerable attention to student sleeping accommodation, aware of the obvious attraction of L.E.A. colleges which provided study-bedrooms. In almost all the colleges the dormitories were considered unsatisfactory, with insufficient space allotted to each cubicle, lack of light and inadequate ventilation. Here, however, the Commission encountered the opposition of Principals who considered privacy to be not only unimportant but undesirable, favouring the retention of dormitories and the discipline imposed by restriction of access to them during the day. The Commission could only comment that the colleges which provided privacy would have an advantage in competition for students, over those refusing to provide it.³

1 Training College Commission (1916) Report, Appendix IV, Detailed Report of Sites and Buildings, pp. 215, 129.

2 Training College Commission (1916) Report, p. 9.

3 Ibid.

The Commission had embarked on its work with an understanding of its brief in terms of fact-finding, and disclaimed any intention of making recommendations of policy.¹ In the writing of the Report, however, the conclusions at which Holland had hinted in his letter to the Archbishop suggesting the enquiry, inevitably emerge.

It was clear that the diocesan emphasis of the colleges had all but disappeared, though they continued to provide limited financial support. But the dioceses of Canterbury, Carlisle, Ely, London, Bath and Wells, Rochester, Sheffield and Southwark had never established their own colleges and, while drawing their teachers from existing institutions, had made no financial contribution. The time had come, insisted Holland and his colleagues, for financial needs to be met by a well-organised and combined effort on the part of the Church, in which every diocese ought to contribute officially to the support of the colleges. No college should deal with one problem in isolation from other problems, or with its own affairs in isolation from other colleges. The problems should be dealt with as a properly co-ordinated whole, 'and having regard to present-day conditions the Church Training Colleges ought not to be left to stand or fall as isolated units'.²

The Commission was not arguing for central control; it spoke instead of 'central supervision' and, here we clearly see Holland's hand, pointed out that in the willingness of the Board of Education

1 Training College Commission (1916) Report, p. 1.

2 Ibid., p. 23.

to treat the Church of England colleges for men as a single unit in the crisis of the war, 'there has been established a precedent which may possibly prove of very great value'.¹

There was concern that the colleges should more and more be considered as central rather than diocesan institutions, but this would not mean, in the Commission's view, that they would in the future be any less in touch with diocesan Church life. Indeed, increased local support and interest was urgently needed. For Holland and his colleagues the way of safety for the Church of England colleges lay in a strong and well-informed central supervision, combined with local participation arising from direct local management. The latter, in varying measure of effectiveness, was already in existence; as yet there was no machinery to provide the former.

Implementation

The Report, with its appendices, presented as Private and Confidential to the Archbishop, provided much food for contemplation. With the appointment of H.A.L. Fisher to the Presidency of the Board of Education in December 1916 educational reform was in the air, and the urgent tone of the Report was insistent that the Church should put its own colleges in order. The Archbishop's response was to appoint an Advisory Committee, consisting of the

1 Training College Commission (1916) Report, p. 11.

Commissioners and others, including Lord Salisbury, to make recommendations in the light of the Report.

At the time of the appointment of the Committee, the Bishop of Wakefield was of the opinion that the National Society was the only body that could provide the central guidance and support called for.¹ The Committee, however, took a broader view and the eventual recommendation, which the Society immediately approved in principle, was that there should be a federation of the colleges under a Board of Supervision, on which the Society would be represented alongside representatives of the Archbishops, diocesan authorities and Governing Bodies. The Board would be for the protection, guidance and support of the colleges and, to that end, its functions would be limited to 'securing that colleges be made and kept thoroughly efficient as regards buildings, staffs and equipment' with regard to both secular and religious requirements.²

The other major proposals of the Advisory Committee concerned finance. A guarantee fund of £20,000 was proposed, to enable the reopening of the men's colleges after the war³, and the establishment of a central fund of £10,000 per annum, to be administered by the Board. In order to ensure maximum efficiency in the colleges, and no doubt to emphasise the central role of the Board, conditions were suggested on which support from central funds should depend.

1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 12, 13.12.1916, p. 411.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, pp. 6-7.

3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 12, 6.6.1917, p. 460.

Here the limits of the Board's control appear to have been set rather wide. The Board was to receive estimates and audited accounts as presented to the Board of Education, and a copy of the staff register as kept for that Board. It was to have access to colleges' correspondence with the Board of Education and to be notified of proposals of a financial nature. It would also need to be satisfied that properly qualified people were appointed to principalships, and to have the right of efficient inspection.¹

The Archbishop received the proposals, and after some few months they were accepted. He had of course been impressed by the argument from necessity but we have to see Davidson's decision as part of that policy of centralisation which had already brought about the setting up of the Central Board of Finance in 1914. It was also part of that policy of seeking more control by the Church over its own affairs which was to issue in the Enabling Act of 1919, of which the Archbishop was the main architect and proponent.² With a strong Board of Supervision in negotiation with Government and formulating comprehensive schemes of improvements to colleges, to be implemented according to an agreed timetable, there would be much less need for Government to intervene in the affairs of individual colleges.

The Advisory Committee's proposals were laid before a meeting of the Bishops in October 1917. The Bishop of Wakefield, writing to his fellow Bishops before the meeting, left them in no doubt of

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, pp. 7-8.

2 G.K.A. Bell (1935) Randall Davidson, p. 979.

that to which they would be committed if they gave their support to the recommendations. The implementation would require a united effort in every diocese, the persuasion of the Committees of their own colleges and a campaign of enlightenment among churchmen generally, which 'will be an education to our many laymen, who do not realise the cardinal importance of our colleges'.¹

Meanwhile Holland, in the course of his negotiations with the Board of Education on Concentration, had been granted a further opportunity to be of influence. He had been invited by officials of the Board to join in frank discussions about future college organisation and finance and had taken advantage of this 'to further arrangements in the direction of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee'. He had been conscious that this concern lay well outside his current sphere of responsibility but had been reassured by receiving the authority of the Archbishop to negotiate on general lines.² Not satisfied with this, however, as a servant of the National Society he sought a similar authority from the Standing Committee, and made the interesting observation that points made in the discussions showed that the Board of Education thinking was very much in line with the main recommendations of the Advisory Committee.³

1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter dated 12.10.1917.

2 National Society Correspondence: notes by Holland, undated.

3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 12, 4.7.1917, p. 473.

It should not surprise us, therefore, that in the middle of July 1917, at a meeting at the Board of Education between Holland, Fisher, L.A. Selby-Bigge, the Permanent Secretary, and R.G. Mayor, the Assistant Secretary in charge of Training Colleges, the Board indicated its willingness to recognise a central body as advocated by the Advisory Committee.¹

The readiness of the Board of Education to go in the direction in which the colleges were being pointed was thus established by the time that a meeting of college representatives was called by the Archbishops on 4th December, 1917, to approve resolutions, setting up a Board of Supervision, which would enable the Archbishops formally to approach the Board of Education. The invitation to that meeting set out the further recommendations of the Advisory Committee, that Principals need not be in Holy Orders and, if they were, should not be beneficed, that there should be a careful definition of the role of the Chaplain, especially in relation to the ultimate authority of a woman Principal, and that there should be a thorough reconsideration of Church inspection of colleges. The over-riding aim was to improve the general efficiency of the colleges, thus meeting those criticisms of the Board about some colleges which up to that time had been privately expressed. The threat, however, was implied that overt pressure by the Board could only be averted by organisation as a unit.²

-
- 1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 12, 18.7.1917, p. 487.
 - 2 ED 24/1833 Letter to Governing Bodies, 7.11.1917. Public Record Office.

It was understood at the meeting that no College Committee would be bound by the vote of its representatives, but the Bishop of Wakefield was pleased to record that the meeting 'so strongly and so decidedly' approved the proposals¹, a verdict disputed by Bede, which later pointed out that its representatives had not been appointed by its Committee but had attended at the invitation of the Bishop of Durham and had therefore not voted.²

The meeting paved the way for the Archbishop to communicate to the Board of Education the details of the proposal, for a triennially elected Board of fifteen members, to include nine Governing Body representatives, two nominees of the National Society and two representatives of dioceses not possessing colleges, together with a Treasurer appointed by the Central Board of Finance and a Chairman appointed by the Archbishops. The colleges were clearly to be brought within the mainstream of Church organisation. The Archbishop hoped that the Board would allow its Inspectors to meet the Board of Supervision from time to time, and formally invited the President to indicate whether the Board would be ready to recognise the federation.³ Fisher's reply was, as expected, welcoming and encouraging and, while refraining from

-
- 1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter to Chairmen of Governing Bodies, 4.1.1918.
 - 2 Report of Joint Conference of Governing Bodies of Bede and St. Hild's, undated. College of St. Hild and St. Bede Archives.
 - 3 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter to H.A.L. Fisher, 20.12.1917.

comment on the details of the scheme, pledged the co-operation of his Department, and his willingness to enter into working arrangements with the Board of Supervision.¹

With the appointment of a small committee to arrange for the election of the first Board it remained only to persuade the waverers and to deal with the misunderstandings and misapprehensions which had inevitably arisen. This task fell to the Chairman-elect, the Bishop of Wakefield.² The intention was that the Board should be a strong body but colleges had to be given the assurance that the limitations of its power were real and not apparent, that its function was to supplement and not to supplant the work of existing Governing Bodies. Thus they were assured that there need be no fear of bureaucratic control. Principals, who as members of college staffs could not be elected to the Board, would have direct access, and when matters affecting a particular college were under discussion representatives would be invited to be present. There was no intention of interfering with the right of access of the individual colleges to the Board of Education.³ Neither was it proposed to interfere with college

-
- 1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter dated 1.1.1918.
 - 2 Bishop G.R. Eden remained Chairman of the Board and of the General Council of Church Training Colleges until 1932, four years after retirement from the bishopric of Wakefield.
 - 3 In discussion with Holland, R.G. Mayor at least contemplated the possibility of the removal of that right at some future date. ED 86/55 Church of England Establishment of a Board of Supervision. Minute Paper 21.12.1917. Public Record Office.

private funds, to require a pooling of resources, or that colleges should contribute to the income of the Board. However, lest such financial assurances should encourage the waverer to stay outside the federation, the information that the National Society's need to provide a new college for Whitelands would be likely to affect its grants to other colleges, was designed to have the opposite effect. The Bishop indicated that a number of colleges had already signified their willingness to join, and asked to be informed of outstanding decisions as soon as possible.¹

No college opted to remain outside the federation but the clear division of opinion about representation sowed the seeds of future controversy and bitterness. At a meeting of college representatives in December 1917 there had been an amendment to the resolution setting out the proposed constitution of the Board, requiring that there should be one representative from each college, but this amendment was lost by thirty votes to sixteen, on the argument that the Board should be small enough to act as its own Executive.²

The argument continued, however, in correspondence between the Secretary of the Bede Committee and the Bishop of Wakefield, which continued until May 1918. Both St. Hild's and Bede had resolved after the December meeting to join the federation only if they were represented on the Board of Supervision or, alternatively,

1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter to Chairmen of Governing Bodies, 4.1.1918.

2 Ibid.

if the Northern province were recognised as an electoral province with three of the nine college representatives, irrespective of the Chairman. The Bishop sympathised with the anxiety of the colleges remote from London that their interests would not be adequately represented, but pointed out that the request was for a third of the representatives whereas the Northern province contained only six of the thirty colleges. More important, however, separation into provincial groups was undesirable when the whole intention was to create unity.

Bede, however, refused to give way, in spite of an appeal from the Archbishop to give the scheme a fair trial and despite also the pressure brought to bear by Wakefield's suggestion that the duty to be imposed on all L.E.A.s, in Fisher's forthcoming Bill, of considering the question of the supply and training of teachers within their area, could well lead to colleges not joining the federation being affected. The matter was only resolved after a compromise suggestion from the Chairman of St. Hild's Committee was accepted. This was that two members should represent the Northern province, if other colleges in the North agreed and if no other regional claims were made. And so it turned out, with the Archbishop approving a modification in the constitution of the Board. The number of college representatives was increased from nine to ten, two of whom were to represent the North. The colleges in the South could not complain, for with three representatives elected by the nine men's colleges, and five by the fifteen colleges for women, the representation was exactly in proportion

to the number of colleges.¹ As we shall see, however, the matter of representation, or lack of it, remained a running sore.

The National Society formally accepted the federation scheme in February 1918, resolving that its grants to colleges other than its own would in future be administered by the Board of Supervision.² The Council of Principals of Church of England Colleges had earlier approved of the scheme, with an effusive expression of gratitude to the Archbishops for their foresight in making provision for it, and submitted a list of people considered suitable for election to the Board. There were, however, only eleven Principals present at the meeting. Their enthusiasm was apparently not shared by all their colleagues, for at the previous meeting of the Council there had been some comment deprecating the hasty steps being taken³, and it was made clear at the first meeting of the Board that some colleges had joined the federation on the understanding that if they received no money they would not be bound by the conditions for receiving grant.⁴

The National Society later described the federation as having come into being at a most critical moment in the history of the colleges⁵, and it was no doubt the atmosphere of crisis which

1 Letters dated 21.1.1918 to 17.5.1918. College of St. Hild and St. Bede Archives.

2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 13, 6.2.1918, p. 27.

3 Council of Principals: Minutes, 9.1.1918, 7.1.1918.

4 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 30.7.1918, p. 19.

5 National Society: Annual Report, 1919, p. 27.

caused the stifling of misgivings which were later to emerge. This is not to deny that there were seen to be advantages of strength in unity, as the generosity of the Board of Education to the men's colleges under the Concentration scheme had demonstrated. There was attraction, too, in the intention that the Board's interests should be wider than those of individual colleges, with the elections ensuring that men and women of distinction should serve. The Board should be 'educationally of commanding weight and influence among Bodies dealing with the training of elementary teachers', not least of which of course was the Board of Education itself.¹

By the middle of July 1918 elections had been completed and the request made that the Board be permitted to meet at the office of the National Society which, it was hoped, would undertake the administrative work of the Board. The first meeting was held on 30th July and Mr. Holland, with the approval of the Society, was appointed Secretary. The Society was thus in both a supportive and, in the person of the Secretary, who was by this time also Secretary of the Society itself², a commanding position. It had nothing to fear from the Board of Supervision.

-
- 1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter from Bishop of Wakefield to Chairmen of Governing Bodies, 4.1.1918.
 - 2 Talbot Baines suggested the appointment of Holland as a reward for his 35 years of service culminating in his work with the Wakefield Commission. Holland was then aged 59 and from 1924 the Society's rule about retirement at 65 was waived in his case. His appointment was extended for 5 years and then annually until he chose to retire at the age of 77.

SECTION II

POST-WAR DIFFICULTIES

CHAPTER 1

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISION AND THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Zebedee describes the period beginning in 1918 as 'an unlovely and unattractive era dominated by economic conditions that were generally bad and often very bad'.¹ They were conditions which made for what Rose has called the 'go-stop syndrome' in teacher-training, which characterised the period between 1918 and 1939.² It was in such an economic climate after the war that the Board of Supervision, working through its indefatigable Secretary, showed itself to have that influence with the Board of Education which it had been claimed would result from the coming together of the colleges in a federation.

It had already been agreed, in 1917, that the Concentration scheme would be gradually undone after the war, as the men were demobilised, and that Holland would act as the Board of Education's agent in the matter.³ The Board indicated that all colleges should reopen by September 1919, but Holland was successful in securing a promise from the Board that it would consider a supplementary grant for 1919-1920 for those colleges needing it, in view of the fact that they would not be opening entirely with new students.⁴

1 D.H.J. Zebedee (1962) Lincoln Training College, 1862-1962, p. 95.

2 M. Rose (1981) A History of King Alfred's College, Winchester, 1840-1980, p. 83.

3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 12, 18.7.1917, p. 487.

4 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 1.5.1919, p. 44.

Chester and York were the first to reopen, after Easter 1919, and in the following months those colleges which had been in military or semi-military use, St. Mark's, St. Paul's Cheltenham, Bede, Exeter, Winchester and St. Gabriel's, were handed back to the college authorities. The only colleges which did not reopen in 1919 were Culham, Peterborough and Westminster, which returned from its Richmond exile in the following year.¹

Already in January 1919, however, it was in the mind of the Board of Supervision that one or more of the colleges might have to remain closed, in the interests of the group as a whole. It was felt that there would not be enough candidates to fill twelve men's colleges, and Culham and Peterborough, the smallest of the colleges and with poor buildings, were thought to have an unlikely future as men's colleges, the latter especially, in the light of the Wakefield Commission's findings. The anxiety, however, was that the places for which they were recognised should not be lost to the Church colleges, and they were advised to reopen for women.² The permission of the Board of Education was sought and obtained, and Peterborough reopened in 1920. The wisdom of such a move seemed to have been confirmed by the granting in 1919 of a temporary increase of accommodation in the women's colleges, of up to 10% beyond the recognised accommodation, to meet the needs of the schools arising out of the raising of the school-leaving age to 14 in the 1918 Education Act.³

1 Board of Education: Report, 1918-19, p. 66.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 17.1.1919, p. 29.

3 Board of Education: Report, 1918-19, p. 68.

The number of students in training for Elementary schools reached its maximum in 1922-1923, with a total of 16,818.¹ There was, however, a shortage of candidates for Carmarthen in 1921, which led to an apparently abortive investigation of the possibility of its recognition, wholly or in part, for women², and the Council of Principals of Training Colleges, formed in 1913, made known to the Board of Education its concern about the general shortage of male candidates at this time. The Council complained about competition from the five Ministry of Labour colleges which had been set up for disabled ex-servicemen, and those previously untrained for any trade, who wished to teach, and regretted that the existing colleges had not been asked to co-operate in the Ministry of Labour scheme. The reply from the Board was that grants for the scheme were for eighteen months, and thus the course had been difficult to combine with those in existing colleges, but no new students were to be admitted after August 1922.³

The major post-war problem, however, was the financial one. The cause in 1919 was the rise in prices, especially of food and

1 Board of Education: Report, 1922-23, pp. 119-120.

2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 12, 1.12.1920, p. 260.

3 ED 86/2 Memorandum of Interview, R.G. Mayor, 18.5.1921. Public Record Office.
Three Church colleges, Westminster, Exeter and Chester, together with Crewe, were in fact involved in the Ministry of Labour scheme, offering courses in handicrafts and, in the case of Exeter, rural science. See Board of Education: Report, 1920-21, p. 52.

services. The Board of Supervision was in the forefront of the action taken by the Voluntary colleges to secure increased grants. The serious position was pointed out by Holland in August 1919, a position such that he had failed so far to induce Culham and Peterborough, cushioned by the promised continuation of supplementary grant, to reopen for the coming academic year. The Board of Education had obviously been in negotiation with the Treasury, for the reply to Holland was almost immediate, awarding an increase of tuition grant from £20 to £25, and an increase for maintenance of one-third on the standard rate of £35 for men and £28 for women.¹

Holland regarded this as inadequate, and his view was shared by the Council of Principals of Church of England Training Colleges, who appointed a sub-committee at the end of 1919 to approach the Board of Supervision about the financial position of the colleges, and a deputation was received in May 1920.² Holland returned to negotiation, and a Roman Catholic deputation was received by the Board of Education.³ For the year 1920-1921 it was at this stage to be of no avail. Holland's impassioned plea that 'we are on the very brink of rather wide-spread collapse unless something is done quickly', received the somewhat dampening reply that financial details furnished by the colleges had not in all cases shown a

-
- 1 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letters dated 7.8.1919, 11.8.1919.
 - 2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 6.5.1920, p. 70.
 - 3 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1920, p. 23.

very urgent need for further large additional assistance.¹ Holland was to turn his attention to the presentation of accounts, at a later date.

By the end of 1920, however, there was a further contributory factor to the financial problem, following the Burnham agreement on national salary scales for Elementary and Secondary teachers. The Board of Supervision realised that to compete successfully for staff, the colleges, and especially the colleges for men, would have to bring salaries into line with the scales recommended for Secondary teachers. Holland's attention had been drawn to the situation at Derby in 1918, where an Infant Lecturer was required at what was described as an 'impossible salary' of £100 per annum.² Acting on the advice of the Board, eight of the Church of England women's colleges and all the Anglican men's colleges except Cheltenham adopted the Burnham scales in September 1920. Another six women's colleges followed suit by May 1921, and it was estimated that the cost to the Church of England colleges would be an additional £20,000 per annum.³ To meet increased salaries at the Roman Catholic college for men, the Catholic Education Council agreed in 1922 to give an annual sum of £900.⁴

1 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letters dated 27.10.1920.

2 National Society, Derby Correspondence: letter from Miss H. Lee, National Society Organiser for Sunday School Work, 23.2.1918.

3 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letter dated 5.4.1921.

4 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1922, p. 26.

The Board of Education was aware of the seriousness of the changed situation and began negotiations with the Treasury. Voluntary contributions to Church of England colleges had risen by 200% between 1913-1914 and 1919-1920, and there had also been an increase, though smaller, in the income of Roman Catholic colleges, but with the cost of maintenance in Voluntary colleges having risen by 50% in that period as opposed to an increase of 100% in L.E.A. residential colleges, the Board was mindful of its Inspectors' view that the Voluntary colleges were sacrificing efficiency to economy. It was recognised that the costs of Voluntary colleges would have to increase if the same level of efficiency were to be reached in both sorts of institution and thus the Board was agreed that there was a minimum sum required to place the finances of the colleges on a workable basis. The task was to convince the Treasury.¹

At the beginning of 1921 the Board of Supervision resolved to press the case for further financial help, and to enlist the support of the other Voluntary colleges in the campaign. The British and Foreign School Society asked the Board of Education, failing a further increase in grant, to take over its four colleges and to assume the responsibility of maintenance and management²,

1 ED 24/1926 Office Committee on Training College Finance. R.G. Mayor, December 1920. Public Record Office.

2 ED 86/57 Letter to Board of Education, 18.4.1921. Public Record Office. The college at Bangor had been transferred to the Local Authority in 1908, and that at Swansea in 1913.

and the Bishop of Wakefield sought an interview to present the case for the Church of England colleges. Saltley, however, had already acted on its own initiative and without reference to the Board of Supervision, and informed the Board of Education that unless satisfactory assurances were received from the Board, notice would be given to close the college in July 1921.¹

The Bishop of Wakefield had to admit that all except two colleges would have serious overdrafts at the end of the current financial year, and with the aggregate figure unlikely to be less than £96,000 that it would be impossible for the Board of Supervision to prevent many of the colleges closing down until prospects became more favourable.²

The problem of overdrafts was one shared with the Methodist and Roman Catholic colleges. Between 1917 and 1922 Westminster's adverse balance rose from £1,849 to £6,808, and that of Southlands from £336 to £2,207.³ The Roman Catholic situation was not quite so critical, in spite of having fees lower than any other colleges, for the salary commitments in the colleges were on a very different basis, as many members of staff were members of the religious communities providing the colleges.⁴ In 1921 only Hull, Salford

1 ED 86/55 Minute Paper, 11.2.1921. Public Record Office.

2 ED 86/55 Letter dated 9.2.1921. Public Record Office.

3 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Reports, 1917-1922.

4 ED 86/55 Minute Paper, 2.4.1921. Public Record Office.

and Southampton were handicapped by overdrawn balances of a serious amount.¹ It would be interesting, however, to know the details of the debate in 1920 which led to the resolution that 'a settlement of the question of assistance to the Training Colleges from public funds upon the principle of the 1902 Act would be acceptable to the Catholic Education Council'.²

The President of the Board of Education, Fisher, was advised to see the Bishop of Wakefield, on the ground that 'an interview may allay fever where a letter may add to it', in order to announce the Treasury's agreement to increase grants in line with the Board's recommendations, and to urge the need to increase fees.³ The increased tuition grants, from £25 to £30 for men, and from £25 to £28 for women, and a 50% increase on the standard rate for maintenance were to be paid for both the current year and for 1921-1922 if there was no marked fall in the price of food.⁴ It was estimated that the total additional income for the Church of England colleges would be in the region of £35,000.

The Catholic Education Council requested a meeting with the Board of Education later in 1921, to discuss finances. The officials of the Board saw little point in such a meeting but agreed to receive a deputation out of consideration for F.R. Anderton, the Secretary

1 ED 86/56 Note of Financial Position of Roman Catholic Colleges, 9.8.1921. Public Record Office.

2 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1920, p. 15.

3 ED 86/55 Minute Paper, 11.2.1921. Public Record Office.

4 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 5.3.1921, pp. 86-88.

of the Council, 'who does a great deal to help us with his Council and is usually successful in keeping them quiet'.¹ The only outcome was a recommendation to increase fees, although it was recognised that this would cause problems for Roman Catholic students, mainly drawn from the less affluent section of the community.

There was a fall in the price of food before August 1921 so the increase in maintenance was reduced from 50% to 33½% for 1921-1922. Holland sought assurances that any further changes in grant would be related only to further falls in the price of food, threatening that without such assurances he would be unable, as Secretary of the National Society, to sign the indentures of those students entering the Society's colleges in 1922 because he could not guarantee that the colleges would remain in being.² The threat was perhaps unreal, but any form of pressure was considered legitimate to alleviate a situation not of the colleges' making.

The Board of Education continued the payment of additional grant until stabilisation of grants to Voluntary colleges following the report of the Departmental Committee in 1925, when the new rates were calculated by reference to the average amounts paid during the last two complete years.³ It was, however, found not necessary to pay the additional grants to Bede, Cheltenham St.

1 ED 86/56 Minute Paper, 1.7.1921. Public Record Office.

2 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letter dated 14.11.1921.

3 Board of Education: Report, 1926-27, p. 52.

Mary's, St. Gabriel's and Carmarthen from 1924¹, and as early as 1921 it had been considered justifiable to make payment of supplementary grant in full to only three of the Roman Catholic colleges, Hammersmith, Kensington and Hull.²

The colleges did not, however, escape the impact of the national economy drive which began in 1921. The consequence of cuts in expenditure ordered in education was that local authorities began to employ fewer teachers and, by October 1922, the Board of Supervision was aware of unemployment amongst newly trained teachers from the Anglican colleges.³ None of the Roman Catholic colleges experienced difficulty in placing the majority of their students at that time⁴, and neither did Southlands, but Westminster anticipated that it would have considerable difficulty in the near future.⁵

The Board of Education, to prevent the unemployment of teachers, and convinced that the over-supply from 1925 onwards would be substantial, issued Circular 1301 in March 1923, ordering a reduction of not less than 5% in the entry to colleges in 1923.

-
- 1 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letter dated 14.4.1926.
 - 2 ED 86/56 Note of Financial Position of Roman Catholic Colleges, 9.8.1921. Public Record Office.
 - 3 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letter dated 19.10.1922.
 - 4 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1922.
 - 5 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1922-23, p. 27.

With its customary consideration for the Board of Supervision, the Board informed Holland of what was in mind, well before the publication of the Circular, and indicated that proposals for Concentration would be considered.¹ The publication of the Circular was the occasion for the first recorded meeting of the General Council of Church of England Training Colleges after a ten-year interval.² It was agreed that the situation brought about by Circular 1301 could best be met by the action of the colleges as a whole, and a well-timed question enabled the plans already being considered by the Board of Supervision to be outlined and approved.³

A 5% reduction in the Church of England colleges amounted to 208 places, but Holland was aware that Concentration in 1923 would be a different matter from Concentration under wartime conditions, and indeed it proved to be so. The need of a new site for Warrington, and the Board of Education's suggestion that the temporary closure of a women's college would be 'more politic from the point of view of the Church of England Training Colleges as a whole', led Holland to make the proposal that Warrington should be closed. This would have lost 160 places, and the remaining 48 places were to be lost by those colleges which had

-
- 1 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letter dated 16.2.1923.
 - 2 The Council henceforth meets to deal with specific matters which are judged to have an element of threat about them.
 - 3 General Council of the Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 10.4.1923.

a large proportion of accommodation for hostel or day students, Cheltenham, Ripon and St. Gabriel's.¹

Warrington, however, refused to accept the Concentration scheme. The argument, that every college would suffer from having to implement a reduction in intake, obviously carried no weight with the college. The Board of Supervision had no power to compel, and the matter was not pressed, as the Board of Education could not act on the advice of Holland and his colleagues without the agreement of the college concerned. A general reduction ensued.²

At the end of 1925 the Board of Education assured the Board of Supervision that the Government was alive to the difficulties and needs of the denominational colleges and had no intention of increasing their difficulties or discriminating against them in the matter of grants, but made it clear that it was necessary for them to bear their share of the economies being made.³ Holland's response was to prepare plans for some permanent Concentration. The policy quietly being pursued by Holland was one of attempting to increase the size of institutions in order to make them more

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 22.2.1923, pp. 149-150.

2 The British and Foreign School Society, its request for its colleges to be taken over, with the implied threat that the Society would cease to provide, chided as irresponsible by the Board of Education, arranged that Borough Road should bear the 5% cut for all three colleges in the south. ED 86/57 Letter from Mr. Mayor, 16.3.1923. Public Record Office.

3 General Council of the Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 5.1.1926.

economically viable, and thus less vulnerable to changes in Government policy. Thus when the Board of Education insisted on the separation of the two establishments in Cheltenham in 1921, the Board of Supervision was happy with the arrangement whereby numbers at the women's college, St. Mary's were reduced from 200 to 170 and those at St. Paul's increased, by the same number, from 120 to 150.¹ Holland was no doubt encouraged by the Departmental Committee's recommendation in 1925 that the Voluntary bodies should consider the possibility of reducing the number of very small colleges², and its commendation of the arrangement recently agreed by both the National Society and the Board of Supervision, for the amalgamation of the Society's two London colleges for men, St. Mark's and St. John's. St. Mark's with 132 students and Battersea with 140 were considered too small for efficiency. A college for 200, on the St. Mark's site, was agreed, and the distribution of the remaining places to help the other men's colleges.³ In 1926, thirteen of the women's colleges were certainly below the minimum economic limit of 150 suggested by the Departmental Committee, and the average size of the men's colleges was only 136. A number of alternative possibilities for closure, suggested by Holland, were discussed by a sub-

1 E.B. Challinor (1978) The Story of St. Mary's College, Cheltenham, p. 47.

2 Board of Education (1925) Report of the Departmental Committee on the Training of Teachers for Public Elementary Schools, (Burnham), p. 168.

3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 13, 8.5.1923, p. 387.

committee of the Board. Hockerill College, Bishop's Stortford, emerged as first in line for closure among the women's colleges, and Culham was again threatened, together with Winchester. No firm decisions were made, however, and the Board took the matter no further, other than to agree that if action were to be taken it should properly begin with Culham.¹

The relationship between the Board of Supervision and the Board of Education in the post-war years was extremely cordial. Individual colleges could still approach the Board of Education, and continued to do so, but the reason for their approach generally became the subject of consultation with the Board of Supervision.² The relationship could be seen as a justification of the federation, and in the formation and development of that relationship in the activities described above, the Board of Supervision was seen, in the main, by the colleges to be acting in their best interests.

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 9.6.1926, p. 232.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 20.12.1926, p. 262.

CHAPTER 2

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISION AND THE COLLEGES

There were aspects of the work of the Board of Supervision in the post-war period which gave the colleges the impression that they were being threatened by that bureaucratic control which the Bishop of Wakefield had taken great pains to deny would be a consequence of federation.¹ The actions of the Board seemed to exhibit little concern with those wider educational interests which had required the election of men of distinction, and it is interesting that the Bishop of Oxford resigned from the Board in 1921, giving as his reason, 'that the business was well conducted and that therefore there was not much necessity for coming to it'.² The business was of course conducted by the Chairman, the Bishop of Wakefield, and, more especially, Mr. Holland.

It was perhaps unfortunate that the Board got into such bad odour from the outset of its existence. Its dealings with Culham caused such a furore, both locally and nationally, that the reputation of the Board suffered ever after. Culham, like Peterborough, was advised in January 1919 to reopen for women. The reasons for this advice were set out in a letter from Holland to the Bishop of Wakefield in September 1919. At the heart of

1 See p. 198.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 3.2.1921, p. 82.

the matter was the Board of Education's view that a stable position for the Church of England colleges required a larger proportion of women students, and that therefore ten colleges for men instead of twelve, and twenty for women would be more suitable in modern conditions. Culham's buildings were in poor condition and had been criticised more than Peterborough's, but if the college were to reopen for women the Board of Education would be satisfied with minor improvements to reduce accommodation from 90 to 60 places. This would help in overcoming another deficiency of the college, the lack of a Demonstration school and, in the college's remote position, limited opportunities for teaching practice, more important than ever at a time when fewer students were entering with any teaching experience. Men's colleges, said Holland, must cater in the future for degree students, and Culham could not bear the additional expense involved.¹

The Bishop of Wakefield used the substance of Holland's letter in his reply to a published letter from the Principal, while respecting Holland's reluctance that a frank statement dwelling on Culham's weaknesses should be made.² It was perhaps a pity that the case could not have been stated publicly at an earlier date, for the recommendation made by the Board of Supervision must have appeared to many supporters of the college, not fully aware of all the difficulties, to be entirely arbitrary.

1 National Society, Culham Correspondence: letter dated 5.9.1919.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 6.11.1919, pp. 55-57.

Naylor describes the fierce national campaign mounted by the old students of the college, the Culham Club, including a mass meeting of protest in London, which forced the College Committee to reverse the decision made in July 1919 to accept the Board's advice and not carry on for men.¹ The agitation had no effect on the National Society, however, which expressed its trust in the Board's judgement in the light of the very full information it had at its disposal.²

The Board of Supervision hastened to admit that the decision lay with the College Council, but warned that to continue would be to court disaster. The Board agreed that it would not desert the Council if it decided to carry on for men, but pointed out that it would not be able to do more than give the help formerly given by the National Society.³ The Board of Education reinforced the warning and made clear that it agreed with the Board of Supervision, which it wished to support. The Bishop of Oxford had suggested that the college should be permitted to reopen for men for a period of two years, and that the matter be reviewed after that time. Privately the Board of Education had no objection, though it accepted the strength of the Board of Supervision's view that staff would have to be employed for whom there would be no definite prospects.⁴ But the feeling was that the Board of Supervision's

1 L. Naylor (1953) Culham, 1853-1953, pp. 111-113.

2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 13, 8.10.1919, p. 174.

3 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 6.11.1919, p. 54.

4 ED 24/1925 1919 Minute Paper, R.G. Mayor, 13.12.1919. Public Record Office.

position should not be made more difficult by encouraging the Governing Body to reopen, even temporarily, for men. Writing to the Bishop, the Secretary of the Board of Education indicated that the importance of strengthening the training college system was so great 'that large sacrifices of local and diocesan autonomy and feeling are necessary'.¹

The college did reopen for men, and disaster did not overtake it, thus confirming the view of its supporters that they had fought the good fight against the high-handed Board of Supervision. The danger, however, had stimulated a successful appeal for funds, in the diocese, to the old students and to a private Trust which contributed generously to the college finances during the next few years.²

The bureaucratic image of the Board of Supervision was reinforced by its efforts to bring about financial efficiency in the colleges and a uniform presentation of accounts. It had been agreed at the setting up of the federation that colleges seeking grants from the Board should furnish a copy of accounts submitted to the Board of Education, and the latter kindly provided additional account forms to enable them to do this. In 1925 the Board of Education accepted Holland's offer to criticise the forms used for the Voluntary colleges, and in the following year he was consulted about the revised heads of expenditure to be introduced

1 ED 24/1925 1919 Letter from L.A. Selby-Bigge to Bishop of Oxford, 16.12.1919. Public Record Office.

2 L. Naylor (1953) Culham, 1853-1953, pp. 114-115.

into the accounts in order to make possible and available comparable figures for all training colleges.¹

The Board of Supervision's attempt to exercise firm financial control over colleges, where administration was in its infancy and where Principals, often without clerical assistance, were responsible for the day to day running of their establishments, was bound to lead to ill-feeling. In 1923, representatives of Chester, Culham, Saltley, York, the Home and Colonial and Whitelands were invited to meet a sub-committee to discuss economies in expenditure.² Early in the following year, colleges were urged to have a professional audit and to be prepared to pay a proper fee for such a service, and later in the year what was considered to be heavy expenditure by St. Mark's, Cheltenham, Chester and Brighton was queried, and all the colleges were told that expenditure on prizes was not necessary in a training college. York, on the other hand, was taken to task because the Board considered that not enough was being spent to secure the efficient working of the college.³

The number of enquiries Holland had to make every year, such as his request to Carmarthen in 1926 to explain why the cost of board had risen by £700 over the previous year⁴, suggests that there was carelessness and inefficiency in the preparation of

1 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letters dated 17.3.1925, 19.3.1926.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 17.5.1923, p. 161.

3 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 14.2.1924, p. 171 and 9.4.1924, p. 173.

4 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 29.4.1926, p. 227.

estimates and accounts. Holland took the opportunity in 1925 of a complaint made by the Principals, whose meetings he appears to have attended from 1924, that the capitation basis of the Board of Supervision's grants of £4 for women and £5 for men was not helpful enough to small colleges, to make this point. He pressed on all colleges that their real needs could only be known if proper balance sheets were drawn up, and that he was only advocating a course 'which every business house found it wise to adopt'.¹ His campaign for efficiency clearly had results in some colleges, for the Central Board of Finance in 1926 was confident that part of its vote to the Board of Supervision, which had hitherto gone to helping colleges to balance their books for maintenance of students, could in future be devoted to helping with structural alterations.² The intervention of the Board was prudential but it was nevertheless resented.

In 1926 the Principal of Chester declined to report criticisms of the accounts to his Governing Body. The Board of Supervision insisted on meeting the Governors, and the case is an illustration of how the Board sought to allay alarm at its powers while at the same time insisting that its wishes be followed. It was stressed to the Governors that all communications from the Board of Supervision were friendly in intention, confidential, and concerned solely to remove the possibility of difficulties arising between

-
- 1 Council of Principals of Church of England Training Colleges: Minutes, 20.3.1925.
 - 2 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. VII, No. 2, 1926, p. 179.

the college and the Board of Education. The situation at Chester was likely to lead to just such difficulties, for there had been excessive expenditure on board over a number of years, catering for the Principal's house was done in the college kitchens and there were financial irregularities stemming from college moneys not being kept separate from the Principal's private accounts. There was no suggestion of misappropriation, though not surprisingly the Principal regarded the Board's intervention as a slight on his honour.¹ No responsible body, however, could have allowed such a situation to continue.

The most serious result of the Board's concern with financial efficiency was the closing of the oldest of the women's colleges, that of the Home and Colonial School Society. The Board's concern began with the inclusion in the college accounts for 1926 of expenditure of £455 on new chapel windows. Such expenditure was criticised in view of the admitted defects in essentials, on which nothing had been spent. But worse was to come, for though the accounts showed that the money had been received as special donations there was no mention of such gifts in the College Annual Report. It became clear that the money had come from the profits of the Society's Depository. This had in reality ceased to exist when the college moved to Wood Green in 1903, but the accountant had persuaded wholesalers of its continued existence. The college was its only customer, not only for books and stationery but also

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 16.3.1927, pp. 266-270.

for food and household materials. The Board was not sure of how much the Governors knew of the matter but was highly sensitive to the irregular tax position of such transactions and ordered the arrangement to cease.¹

The college was tardy in its response. The Board met the Governors in January 1927 and their unease is reflected in a letter sent after the meeting, asking for further categorical assurances 'in respect of the future conduct of the Training College and of the Home and Colonial Society'.² The Society eventually agreed to put its house in order and to publish the accounts of the College, the Depository and the Society separately. The investigation, however, made the Board aware that nothing had been done to remedy the defects pointed out by the Wakefield Commission's architects, whose report the college denied having received. Indeed, the Society's Annual Report for 1924-25 had looked forward to the college being free of debt in the near future, when it would be 'a magnificent estate of which the whole Church of England may well be proud'.³ The Board pointed out that, ten years after Wakefield, substantial improvements were necessary if continued recognition were not to be seriously imperilled.⁴ The Governors again made no response without being

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 9.6.1926, pp. 237-240.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 16.3.1927, p. 265.

3 Home and Colonial School Society: Report, 1924-25, p. 15.

4 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 9.6.1926, pp. 242-244.

prompted. The Board more than a year later again drew the attention of the Governors to the great urgency of repairs and improvements, but the discouraging response from the Principal was that nothing had been raised towards the existing debt of £2,500 on the college and there was not the least likelihood of any contribution towards such a sum being made.¹

The Board of Supervision took action and, after a report by the Board of Education architect on the college buildings, it recommended that either a reconstruction scheme should be undertaken or the affairs of the college should be wound up and its funds transferred to Cheltenham, with which it was in theological sympathy.² The Board did not, however, come forward with any scheme of support which might have encouraged the Governors to take in hand a rebuilding scheme, and dismissed the suggestion made by the Principal that the college should be taken over centrally, presumably by the Board of Supervision.³ Faced with the alternatives, the college decided to close, in 1929, and Holland lost no time in seeking permission from the Board of Education to redistribute its 200 places among the remaining women's colleges.⁴ The closure of the Home and Colonial College came at an opportune time, as discussions in 1926, about increasing the size of some colleges by closure of others, had come to nothing.

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 17.11.1927, p. 38.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 20.2.1928, p. 48.

3 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 15.6.1928, p. 56.

4 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letter dated 25.5.1928.

The intervention in financial matters was tolerated, if resented, but the concern which the Board showed in the matter of appointment of Principals was felt to be an infringement of the rights of Governing Bodies. It was, of course, a condition of grant from the Board that it should be satisfied that fit and proper persons were appointed, but the Board was not content to give a merely formal approval, but required that the short-list of candidates should be submitted before appointment was made.¹

The concern was principally to check educational qualifications, and in the case of Brighton in 1927 the Board indicated that it could not support the appointment of a candidate who had had no previous training college experience.² At Derby, the college took a stand and ignored a request for the short-list, notifying the Board after the appointment of a new Principal in 1927. On being rebuked by the Bishop of Wakefield, the college submitted the short-list some months later, and the Board withheld its approval of the appointment until after it had received it.³ Honour was somehow satisfied on both sides.

Fuller's comment on the Principal of Exeter's attitude to the Board of Supervision in this period, that he 'ignored its counsels in his administration of St. Luke's'⁴, describes an

-
- 1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 9.6.1926, p. 236.
 - 2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 16.3.1927, p. 273.
 - 3 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 7.7.1927, p. 9, and 17.11.1927, p. 29.
 - 4 F.W.T. Fuller (1971) 'The History of St. Luke's College, Exeter, 1839-1970', unpublished thesis, vol. 2, p. 407.

attitude which would have been shared by other Principals. There must have been considerable irony in the concluding remark of the Principal of Chichester in a long letter in 1928 defending the college's high expenditure on board, 'I am asked to tender the thanks of my Council to the Board of Supervision for the valuable advice given to them in their administration of the college'.¹ However well-meaning were the activities of the Board on behalf of the Church of England colleges as a whole, there was increasing resentment against the taking of decisions by a body on which there was no individual college representation. Suspicion seems to be the most appropriate word to describe the emotion felt towards the Board in many of its activities, by the colleges it sought to represent.

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 2.11.1928, p. 74.

CHAPTER 3

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC COLLEGES IN THE POST-WAR YEARS

The financial problems of the Roman Catholic colleges may not have been as serious as those of their Anglican counterparts, but the colleges were faced with a crisis of a different nature in the post-war years, arising out of Inspectors' reports on the colleges in 1918. The Report of the Catholic Education Council for that year contained the statement that the Board of Education had decided to send to all colleges 'experts' to hear lectures, and thus to give an opportunity to see work which would subsequently be tested by written papers.¹ In the following year it was reported that a special committee had been appointed to confer with the Board of Education, at its request, on the question of improving the staffing and efficiency of the colleges.²

Behind that terse announcement lay the critical situation revealed by the Inspectors, for the continued recognition of some of the colleges was in danger. The 1904 Regulations concerning the approval of the Board for the appointment of staff had clearly been applied with sympathy for the paucity of Catholic women

1 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1918, p. 41.

2 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1919, p. 26. The annual reports submitted by the women's colleges to the Catholic Education Council in this period consist largely of accounts of visits of dignitaries, of fests and festivals and of deaths of prominent individuals. Inserted among these accounts are the academic records, but little comment.

graduates, and making full compensatory allowance for the general cultural background which the members of religious Orders brought to the training of students. The Board admitted that it had been too liberal, granting recognition too easily in some cases, 'without sufficiently realising how seriously the future development of the college must be conditioned by the capacity of the controlling Order'.¹ The end of the war brought the period of reckoning.

The position at Hammersmith was felt to be the most serious, because it was the only college for men. The Board had been concerned since 1912 about the inability of the controlling Order to secure a Principal of whom the Board could wholeheartedly approve. The occupant of the post in 1918 was provisionally recognised, but the Inspector's view was that the staff should be reorganised and reconstituted from top to bottom, beginning with a better-educated Principal. Since 1912 there had been no clerical member of the staff, except one with no experience of teaching, who had had the requisite academic qualifications.² The college's case was urgent, said R.G. Mayor, in a comment revealing of attitudes held in the Board at that time, because 'while there may be room in the teaching profession for women whose educational attainments are not very high ... there can be no room at all ... for ill-educated men'.³

-
- 1 ED 86/56 Memoranda on the history of various Roman Catholic Colleges. Letter from L.A. Selby-Bigge, 14.1.1920. Public Record Office.
 - 2 ED 86/56 Minute paper, undated. Public Record Office.
 - 3 ED 86/56 Minute paper, H. Ward to R.G. Mayor. Public Record Office.

The writer of the above comment placed the women's colleges in order of merit, in terms of efficiency. At the head of the list came Mount Pleasant, long acknowledged to be in the front rank of training colleges. Then came Kensington St. Charles and St. Mary's Newcastle, both of them efficient but handicapped by partial enclosure of the nuns. Thus at Kensington a secular representative of the Principal sat on Committees, leaving her with little or no direct influence on policy. Salford was placed firmly in the middle, doing 'sound though not brilliant work'. On the three remaining colleges for women, Hull, Southampton and Selly Park, Birmingham, Mayor commented, 'I think it doubtful whether any of the three last named ought to have been recognised by the Board'.¹ The Board had accepted promises made by the religious Orders about the provision of adequate staff, at face value, and these had not been fulfilled. We have already seen, in the matter of the 1907 Regulations, the wary attitude adopted by the Board towards the Roman Catholic community, and clearly, in the matter of establishing colleges it had been anxious not to put obstacles in the way of the community meeting its needs. The results of that policy could, however, no longer be ignored.

The Inspection of the colleges had revealed that the Principal of Hull, then aged 75 and with a Certificate gained in 1866, had little idea of modern educational developments and stifled the enterprise of the two members of staff, out of a total of thirteen,

1 ED 86/56 Minute paper, H. Ward to R.G. Mayor. Public Record Office.

who were thought to be capable. Only five members of staff were graduates, the best a London External, and the Principal could not see why a capable pupil should not at once become a member of the teaching staff. There was a problem of conflict between the lay and Religious staff, centred on the fact that the former were the better qualified, while the latter had all the influence and yet were not up to the work, especially the supervision of teaching practice.¹ At Southampton there was an almost identical situation, with an incompetent Principal, 'unsuitable in every respect for the post', and dissension between the Religious and secular staff.²

Selly Park, Birmingham, came last in Mayor's list and little was found which could be considered of merit. It had been founded in 1910 primarily for the training of nuns of the Order of Sisters of Charity, and had been certified as efficient for that purpose, but not placed on the grant list. There had been a promising beginning under a Religious but she had been dismissed when she had tried to insist on the non-interference of the Convent. Yet there had been only one member of the Community with any pretensions to educational qualifications. The Board had therefore insisted on separation and the college had reopened in 1917 with a secular Principal. She had never been considered satisfactory, but the Board considered that no one better was likely to accept the post.

1 ED 86/56 Memorandum, Hull, 11.4.1919. Public Record Office.

2 ED 86/56 Memorandum, Southampton, 5.6.1918. Public Record Office.

Her lack of judgement was thought to be evidenced in everything she touched. One member of staff was the mainstay of the place, and almost entirely responsible for the whole of the academic work of the college. The verdict was that 'the scope and demands of modern education are beyond its comprehension', and the college was therefore judged unsuited to the training of teachers.¹

In view of the Inspectors' findings, the Board invited the Catholic Education Council at the end of April 1919 to appoint a committee to meet the Board. It was pointed out that the Anglicans were taking steps to put their training college system in order, and that a policy of inaction or delay on the part of the Roman Catholics, with apparently greater difficulties, would be bound to lead to disaster.² It was not, however, until two and a half months later that a deputation could be put together, and the contrast between the lack of urgency here and the almost daily contact with Holland and immediate response from the Board of Supervision in this period, is marked. At the interview with the Board, the possibility of withdrawal of recognition was mentioned, but the assurance was given that the Council would be afforded every opportunity to remedy the situation. From the Catholic side, it was stressed that the Council was strong enough to secure respect for its opinions. The suggestion also came, from a member of the deputation, that the colleges should be

1 ED 86/56 Memorandum, Selly Park, 11.4.1919. Public Record Office.

2 ED 86/56 Letter to F.R. Anderton from L.A. Selby-Bigge, 24.9.1919. Public Record Office.

federated, with the Orders providing the buildings but the teachers being appointed by a Federal Council.¹ The suggestion was not, however, followed up.

The Council clearly did have difficulty in getting the colleges to accept the validity of the Board's criticisms, and was in an awkward position. The communities owned the buildings and could not be replaced by other Orders. Only in the case of Hammersmith, which the Council owned, would it have been possible to make such a change, and although this was considered, no action was taken. After a further six months had elapsed, the Secretary of the Council requested the Board to send him a letter, setting out the situation and laying the blame at the door of Orders who were not up to the work. Anderton obviously wanted his hand strengthening in dealing with both the Council and the colleges. Selby-Bigge, the Secretary of the Board, duly obliged, and insisted that 'the time has really come for very definite action on your part, and if not on your part, then on ours'.²

The implied threat of withdrawal of recognition, a ploy acceptable to Anderton, had the desired effect. The communities running the three offending women's colleges gave the Board an assurance that they were taking steps to increase the number of well-qualified staff, and that in the case of appointment of Principals they would comply with the Board's requirement that

1 ED 86/56 Memorandum of Interview, 15.7.1919. Public Record Office.

2 ED 86/56 Letter from F.R. Anderton, 2.1.1920, and reply, 14.1.1920. Public Record Office.

there should be a wide field of selection. The Board in its turn left the colleges in no doubt that it would exercise its supervision of staff appointments with more stringency than it had done before.¹

Mayor regarded this as a promising beginning, but was not prepared to leave matters entirely in the hands of the Council. The Board itself was to watch developments carefully and to make sure that the efforts set on foot, especially for the improvement of staff qualifications, were not relaxed. To that end the communities were required to keep the Board informed of the number of staff working for degrees, and the results obtained.²

The Board must have been satisfied with the efforts being made. It did not oppose the provision of a new and enlarged college for men at Strawberry Hill, built out of the proceeds of the sale of the Hammersmith property, in 1925³, and the Board's Inspection Report on Kensington St. Charles in 1926 showed that, though the staff was still not sufficiently strong in scholarship, the work of the college as a whole was considered 'sound, interesting and alive'.⁴ There must have been substantial improvement at

1 ED 86/56 Interview Memorandum, 28.4.1920. At the Church of England College in Truro in 1917 the Board approved the appointment as Principal of a non-graduate who had been Vice-Principal since 1903, but required a graduate to be in charge of academic studies. See M.G. Brown (1938) Training in Truro, 1813-1938, p. 51.

2 ED 86/56 Letter to F.R. Anderton from L.A. Selby-Bigge, 20.5.1920. Public Record Office.

3 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1926, p. 31.

4 ED 115/52 1925-1926 Kensington St. Charles, Public Record Office.

Selly Park. It was the object of a special inspection by three H.M.I.s, including the Chief Inspector of Training Colleges, in 1924, and provision for the needs of the students was found to be 'entirely adequate'.¹ The Local Education Authority was impressed with the work of the college in its area, and joined in pressing its claim to be placed on the grant list.² A major effort must have been made by the college, for its claim was eventually conceded in 1927.

A federation of the Roman Catholic colleges was not feasible because of the authority vested in the Catholic Education Council by the hierarchy. What did emerge in 1921, and perhaps as a result of the crisis, was an Association of Catholic Training Colleges, and it was also suggested that an annual conference of Principals should be held.³ In 1925 the Council appointed a Standing Committee for the Training Colleges, to enable it to keep a more watchful eye on their affairs and to emphasise its central role.⁴ When, however, in 1927, the Association suggested the formation of a joint Training Colleges and Council Committee, it met with a polite but firm refusal.⁵ There was to be no power sharing.

-
- 1 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1924, p. 44.
 - 2 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1926, p. 39.
 - 3 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1921, pp. 16, 21.
 - 4 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1925, p. 20.
 - 5 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1927, p. 22.

SECTION III

THE BEGINNING OF RECOVERY

CHAPTER 1

THE NATIONAL SOCIETY AND OTHER CENTRAL BODIES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

The National Society had nothing to fear from the Board of Supervision, because the latter body was dependent for its financial resources on the Central Board of Finance, and on the National Society itself, in whose Annual Report for 1922 the Board's first triennial report was published. The setting up, however, in 1920 of the National Assembly of the Church of England, as the representative body of the Church, together with what Lloyd describes as 'an army of subordinate councils and Conferences for every diocese, rural deanery and parish'¹, seemed for the moment to put the Society off the centre of the stage. The financial organisation of the Assembly, through the Central Board of Finance, in the establishment in the dioceses of the system by which both diocese and Assembly were financed by an annual levy on every parish through annual quota payments, seemed also to endanger the Society's ability to continue its work. The years after 1920, however, see the Society continuing, in conjunction with other bodies, to make a major contribution, as planning for the colleges' future begins to take the place of struggling for survival.

1 R. Lloyd (1966) The Church of England, 1900-1965, p. 252. The title of the representative body was shortened to Church Assembly in 1923.

The central position of the Society in education seemed to be threatened by the intention of the Assembly to set up an Education Committee. The attitude of the Society was expressed by Holland in a Memorandum in 1920. He outlines its position as the central organisation of the Church in England and Wales, in respect of Elementary education and of training colleges, the organisation with which most Elementary schools and colleges were expressly connected by the terms of their Trust Deeds, and of which Diocesan Education Boards were, historically, local branches. There was agreement, however, that the time had come to remodel the central machinery of the Church for the work of education, in view of the creation of the Central Board of Finance, the formation of the National Assembly, and the recent separation of four dioceses from the Province of Canterbury to form the Province of the Church in Wales.¹

It was expected that the proposed Education Committee would, from the outset, seek to exercise control over the Church's educational policy and over every other aspect of the Church's educational work. Holland argued, however, that the National Society, with its premises, organisation, contacts with dioceses, the Board of Education and L.E.A.s, its records and staff and organs of communication, could supply all the requirements of a central department of the Church for education, with a change of

1 National Society Correspondence: Memorandum on the National Society, 1920. The Church in Wales was disestablished in 1914, but the Act did not come into force until March 1920.

constitution to reflect the position of the Central Board as the provider of finance. It was also made abundantly clear that any arrangement which involved either rivalry with the National Society or duplication of the work it had developed would be not only wasteful but also indefensible.¹

Perhaps the National Society's influence prevailed, for the Assembly balked the issue and appointed an Education Committee with a single reference, to report on the desirability of advising Church of England Secondary schools to be placed on the grant list, in the light of the 1919 Regulations for Secondary schools.² In the course of its work there was full consultation with the National Society and in 1922 the Committee appointed Mr. Holland as its Secretary.³ The interests of the Society and, with the Bishop of Wakefield as Chairman of the Committee, those of the Board of Supervision, would be adequately safeguarded.

The consultation with the Society led to the Bishop's request in 1924 that the Committee should be strengthened with members from outside the Assembly, and the consequence was the appointment of a Commission, which included the Education Committee, 'to survey the present position of the religious education question'.⁴ Its

-
- 1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 13, 20.10.1920, p. 239.
 - 2 National Assembly of the Church of England: Minutes of Proceedings, Summer 1921, Minute 166, N.A. 36.
 - 3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 13, 11.10.1922, p. 347.
 - 4 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. IV, No. 2, 1924, p. 184.

recommendations were consistent with National Society policy. The Commission insisted that in any settlement of the religious education question regard must be had to two underlying principles. There must be statutory provision for religious education in all schools and training colleges, and there must be provision for denominational teaching. It was suggested that the machinery for putting this into effect should consist of central and local religious education committees set up by the Board of Education and L.E.A.s.¹ Its report, however, did not go further than this, to suggest how a national settlement might be arrived at, and the report met with some criticism in the Assembly for this shortcoming.

In 1926 the Assembly appointed another Commission on Religious Education, under Sir Henry Hadow, with wider terms of reference. They were to look into the position of religious education in the country and 'its relation to the development of National Education at all levels'. The Bishop of Wakefield, feeling that two Commissions in the field would lead to confusion, and that the work of the body he had chaired had been completed, asked for its discharge, and this was granted in 1927. The Bishop's request, that the Assembly should appoint in its place a committee as an advisory body in connection with matters of current educational policy, was not followed up.²

1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. II, No. 3, 1926, p. 398.

2 Church Assembly: Minutes of Proceedings, Spring 1927, Minute 25, C.A. 226.

Nothing had happened since 1920 to cause the National Society to think that the Assembly was likely to be effective in the sense of providing a central forum and machinery for determining educational policy. Historically that had come to be in the hands of others, and the Society still had a significant role to play in this sphere.

The role of the Society as financial provider looked more problematical. At the special request of the Archbishops the Central Board from the first was pledged to give a large measure of support to the training colleges, and it had been agreed that the Central Church Fund Appeal should include the sum of £15,000 per annum and £100,000 for capital development of the colleges.¹ The Board of Supervision had high hopes of help for the colleges from the Central Board, but by 1920 the total reached by the Appeal was only £400,000, and the contributions received by the Board of Supervision in its first triennial period reflected this. Nothing was received for capital expenditure, but a total of £33,000 had been paid towards maintenance costs, £3,000 during the first year and the promised £15,000 in each of the following years. The money provided by the National Society in that period totalled £7,131, and most was used towards clearing capital expenditure debts incurred during the three years or previously. Sixteen colleges had been helped in this way.²

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 1.10.1918, p. 22.

2 National Society: Annual Report, 1922, p. 30.

The second of the two Resolutions of the Society's Annual Meeting, which indicated each year what was uppermost in the concern of the Society, urged in 1920 the importance of both the Society and the Central Board being enabled to give colleges all the help they needed¹, but the Society recognised that the prospect of permanently maintaining its position independently of the Central Board of Finance was not encouraging. The proposal was made in 1920, on behalf of the Central Board, that the Society should at an early date cease to collect its own income², and in 1922 the Society was invited to a conference by the Co-operation Committee of the Assembly, which had been set up with a view to bringing about administrative economy and efficiency in central Church work. The outcome was probably of less moment than had been intended. There was agreement on the importance of co-operation, and the Assembly was urged to issue a public statement drawing attention to the work of the central societies and their need of financial support.³ The Assembly representatives would have been swamped by the representatives of the societies, all of whom would have been determined to safeguard their continued existence, and financial independence.

Nevertheless, the intention of the Central Board of Finance was that the colleges should be regarded as a central matter.

-
- 1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 12, 16.6.1920, p. 224.
 - 2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 12, 20.10.1920, p. 239.
 - 3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 13, 6.12.1922, p. 361.

For 1922, however, the Bishop of Wakefield succeeded in ensuring that a Diocesan Board of Finance could continue to appeal for any college it had previously supported, but the sums thus contributed by dioceses were set against the additional £15,000 provided by the Central Board in 1922, leaving only £4,400 to be allocated.¹ It was agreed, however, that no college would be penalised in the allocation because it received help from the diocese, unless the diocese had not contributed its full quota to the Central Board. Then it became possible for a diocese to earmark money for a training college within its own area, and that contribution could be reckoned as part of the diocesan quota to Assembly funds. Such earmarking was a natural expression of hostility to centralisation and the Central Board was not happy about it. In 1924 it was necessary for the Board to make a statement to the effect that in dealing with the colleges it had adopted a permanent principle, that they 'should be treated as in the care of the Assembly and not of the dioceses within whose boundaries they were situated'.² Most colleges had for long been national rather than diocesan institutions, but here was a declaration that they were institutions of the corporate Church, with the implied loss of some measure of local control, which events were making inevitable.

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 28.6.1922, p. 122.

2 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. IV, No. 2, 1924, p. 42.

At this time the Assembly's income was just over £100,000 per annum. The Budget vote for the colleges in 1924 was £20,000, with an additional £5,000 for capital expenditure, and the decision was taken that the grant ceiling to the colleges should be £30,000.¹ The total income of the National Society was in the region of £18,500 per annum, of which about £2,000 was donated to the Board of Supervision, with an additional £600 per annum for the Welsh colleges.² The commitment of the Central Board to the colleges, and the needs of the National Society's own London colleges in 1924, meant that co-operation between the two bodies was essential, in working with the Board of Supervision, but it was clear that the resources needed to put the colleges on the road to recovery would have to come from elsewhere.

1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. IV, No. 2, 1923, p. 154.

2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 12, 20.10.1920, p. 239.

CHAPTER 2

THE FIRSTFRUITS OF CO-OPERATION

The Wakefield Commission had indicated that a radical solution was necessary in the case of the college at Warrington and in that of Whitelands. This was reinforced by the Board of Education requirement in 1921 that Warrington should remove to a new site, and in the following year the National Society indicated that it would welcome the Board of Supervision's advice on the future of Whitelands. Consideration of the two colleges was referred to a sub-committee and it was agreed that Warrington should remove to Liverpool, and that if St. Mark's and St. John's were to combine, the buildings of the latter could house Whitelands.¹ It was no doubt the possibility of providing a home for Whitelands which hastened the amalgamation of the two men's colleges, and the eventual decision not to use Battersea brought forth a protest from a former Principal, and the feeling aroused among old students about the circumstances of the closing of the college did not die down for some time.²

The amalgamation of the two colleges could not be accomplished without expense, for alterations were necessary at St. Mark's in order to accommodate the students from Battersea. £30,000 was the estimated cost, and the National Society reckoned that it

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 1.2.1923, p. 142.

2 National Society, Battersea Correspondence: letter from W.B. Hards, 2.10.1928.

would also have to find £15,000 for a new site for Whitelands.¹ The case of Warrington came to a head with a disastrous fire during the Christmas holidays of 1923, which led firstly to the distribution of first-year students, enabling the receiving colleges, Truro, Cheltenham and Tottenham, to make good the 1923 cut of 5%, then the suspension of the operation of the college, and then its temporary occupation of the buildings of Battersea² until the completion of the new college in Liverpool in 1930.

The National Society decided to issue an appeal for its 'necessitous schools and colleges'. In supporting the appeal, the Archbishop of Canterbury urged that the needs of the colleges should be placed first, for their importance to the Church was as providers of teachers for definite religious instruction.³ The Central Board of Finance, clearly alarmed at the Society's intention, approached the Archbishop about the possible effect of such an appeal on its own funds, together with a local appeal for Warrington. It is difficult to imagine that he had not foreseen the difficulties but in his reply he agreed that to have independent appeals would be to continue 'doing the very thing that we have been trying to get rid of in our Church's life', and that the Society should therefore rely on the appeal for the Central Church Fund for help for the training colleges. He

-
- 1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 13, 12.12.1923, p. 420.
 - 2 National Society: Annual Report, 1926, p. 23.
 - 3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 13, 6.2.1924, p. 432.

suggested, however, that the time had come for the Society and the Central Board to get together. 'I am not suggesting that the National Society should simply be swallowed up in the National Assembly Education Committee', but they were to work out some arrangement which would enable them to deal firstly with the immediate question of the particular colleges in peril or in need of rebuilding, and then with the general training college situation.¹

The Archbishop's advice was timely, for the financial pressures were mounting and the way forward was not clear. The two bodies lost no time in coming together in a most significant meeting, which cleared the air and enabled useful co-operation to take place between the Society and the Central Board without the former feeling that its situation was being threatened. The Board of Supervision was not officially represented at the meeting; the paymasters are the effective policy makers.

The meeting looked at the matters needing immediate attention, the rebuilding of Whitelands and Warrington and substantial alterations at St. Mark's, and it was agreed that at least £250,000 of new money would be required in the course of the following twenty-five years for capital expenditure. The Society indicated that it might expect to raise £120,000 on its mortgageable assets, and the remainder was to come from loans from National Society subscribers and, in the case of Warrington, by private local appeal by the Bishops of Manchester, Liverpool and Chester. The Assembly was to be asked to provide £15,000 per annum to service the loans.²

1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 13, 12.3.1924, p. 440.

2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 13, 2.4.1924, p. 448.

The argument now moved to the Assembly where, in the summer of 1924, the agreement between the Society and the Central Board was ratified, and the Assembly authorised the Central Board to raise by loan such capital sums as were required to maintain a high standard of efficiency in the colleges. The matter was not, however, agreed without the expression of considerable concern about the addition to the burden of first charges on the Assembly for the next thirty years, in consequence of which the Bishop of Durham voted against the resolution, 'in the interests of honest finance'.¹

The anxieties returned in the following year, when it was revealed that there had been serious under-estimation of the sums required. The alterations at St. Mark's would cost £51,000, the new college for Warrington £150,000 instead of £100,000, and the cost of Whitelands would exceed the original estimate of £120,000. Thus the sum of £360,000, not £250,000 was required. This revelation again raised the question of the amount of charges on an income of only just over £100,000, and an income vulnerable to a diocesan decision at short notice to reduce its contribution to the Assembly quota. The Assembly did not have the powers to compel payment of the full amount. All depended on co-operation with the Diocesan Boards of Finance, and they in turn on the response of the parishes. With the revised estimates it was now a matter not of £15,000 for thirty years, but of £20,000 for forty-three years.

1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. V, No. 2, 1924, pp. 140ff.

The alternative to going ahead with the full scheme was to put off the removal of Whitelands, but there was a risk of closure by the Board of Education if action were not soon taken, and great play was made in the Assembly debate of the effect of the loss of a college with such an established reputation.

The question was raised by one speaker, seeking referral back, of the likely future capital needs of other colleges and of how they were to be met, but these seem to have been played down in the interests of the major scheme. Indeed an assurance was given by the Financial Secretary, Canon Partridge, that when the three colleges had been dealt with, all the colleges in England would be in a reasonable state of efficiency, which he must have known not to be the case.¹ A comment from one speaker, voicing the widespread suspicion at diocesan and parish level of all that went on at the centre, that the Central Board had not established its reputation for financial soundness before the dioceses sufficiently to justify it in making such large charges, brought the reply from the Bishop of Manchester that the Central Board had 'never done a better piece of business from the point of view of securing the confidence of the dioceses of the North West, than when it undertook to rebuild Warrington by loan'. The loan method of raising the money would have met with the least

1 Partridge played an important part in the Assembly, as its Financial Secretary from 1921 to 1934 and Secretary of the Central Board of Finance from 1919 to 1934. His contribution in those offices and as Bishop of Portsmouth from 1936 is marked by the naming of one of the main Halls in Church House, Westminster, after him.

objection from the diocesan boards, while to raise £360,000 by appeal would have disastrously affected their whole financial machinery.

The referral back was negatived, but only by 177 votes to 120, and the raising of the £360,000 by loan was approved.¹ The Central Board was conscious that the Assembly had accepted the scheme only with reluctance, and it was at pains to point out that it was with equal reluctance that the Board had put forward the scheme, but there was no reasonable way of escape from the additional financial burden.²

The decision was taken to raise the money by the issue of 4½% debentures, guaranteed as a first charge on the revenues of the Central Board, for which the Assembly undertook to provide the sum of £19,800 annually. This Church Training Colleges Capital Fund was an experiment in Church finance arranged by the Central Board's bankers, and the Board recognised that it would have to proceed with caution. There could be no general public appeal, for such was legally debarred, and success in sales would therefore depend largely upon personal contact. In an appeal to the 350 lay members of the Assembly in 1926 the point was stressed that by adopting the loan method it would be possible 'to spread heavy charges over many shoulders and many years'.³ The 'many shoulders

1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. VI, No. 1, 1925, pp. 104ff.

2 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. VI, No. 3, 1925, p. 540.

3 National Society Correspondence: Church Colleges Capital Fund, April 1926.

over many years' did not necessarily appreciate the advantages of the arrangement as seen by the Assembly at the time.

To the investor the issue was not without its attractions, for the rate of interest was but one half per cent below that on Government securities. Manchester, Liverpool and Chester got off to a good start and by 1926 had invested £91,000 on behalf of the replacement of Warrington. There was not the same local interest in Whitelands, and the issue as a whole proceeded slowly, with £170,000 worth issued by 1927 and £250,000 worth issued or applied for by 1929.¹

The procedure for operating the Capital Fund in the execution of what later came to be known as Scheme I had been agreed between the Central Board and the National Society in 1924, and here we see an interplay of forces. All schemes had to be approved in general by the Education Committee of the Church Assembly and the Board of Supervision. When a scheme had been thus approved, the financial details were to be entrusted to a joint committee consisting of the Finance Committees of the Central Board and the National Society, with the Secretary of the Central Board as Convenor. The practical and technical questions were to be entrusted to a committee consisting of the Board of Supervision in consultation with the Governing Body concerned, but the decision of the Board of Supervision would be final. In the case of disagreement between the two committees, the matter would be referred

1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. X, No. 2, 1929, p. 247.

to the Assembly. Any new college sites would be conveyed without Trust to the Central Board on behalf of the Assembly, which was to provide the whole of the cost. In the case of partial rebuilding, or addition, as at St. Mark's, there would be no interference with existing Trusts, but the interests of the Assembly would be safeguarded in the event of the buildings being no longer used for educational purposes.¹

All four bodies who could claim to be concerned in the future of the colleges thus had a part to play in the procedure as originally drawn up. One of the immediate consequences was the decision that no representatives of dioceses without training colleges should be elected to the new Board of Supervision at the end of 1924, and they were replaced by two representatives of the Central Board of Finance, thus reflecting the importance of its role.²

The new building for Warrington went ahead in a suburb of Liverpool, and the new buildings for St. Mark's were completed in time for the beginning of the 1926 academic year. Whitelands survived a proposal to site the new college at Redhill in Surrey, the Principal, Miss Mercier, taking her objections to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Such a move, it was argued, into what was then considered the depths of the country, would be the foundation of a new college rather than the continuance of Whitelands, and would

1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 13, 8.10.1924, p. 475.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 4.2.1926, p. 211.

run counter to all modern developments in training. A college outside London, she insisted, would hardly be an attraction to candidates from a distance, for it could offer nothing which could not be found in the local colleges of their own area.¹ The point was taken, and the college reopened in Putney in 1930. Scheme I had been successfully completed.

1 National Society, Whitelands Correspondence: Report from Miss Mercier to Council, 27.10.1925.

CHAPTER 3

THE NEED FOR SCHEME II

Although attention in this period was focussed on the execution of Scheme I, the needs of other colleges were not forgotten. In addition to the servicing of debentures, the Central Board also made available the sum of £12,900 per annum, divided between maintenance and capital grants to help other colleges to improve their buildings, but the initiative for substantial renovation lay with the individual institutions.

Some colleges were able to raise loans in order to finance improvements, though St. Hild's was the only one to undertake a major reconstruction, in a complete conversion of its sleeping accommodation to provide study-bedrooms for all its students.¹ Carmarthen was able to build a block of study-bedrooms and, like St. Hild's, used money from fee income to service the necessary loans, but there was much still to be done, for there was inadequate accommodation for social life and for teaching.² Winchester was able to instal central heating and electricity, with the help of compensation in respect of its war-time occupation by the Army Pay Office³, and Exeter also was able to make

1 A.L. Lawrence (1958) St. Hild's College, 1858-1958, p. 43.

2 ED 115/93 Carmarthen Training College, Report of Inspection, January 1929. Public Record Office.

3 National Society, Winchester Correspondence: Post-War Developments, March 1923.

some improvements after war-time use by the military authorities, and in 1924 was planning the conversion of its sleeping accommodation.¹

The Principal of Chester saw no chance of undertaking rebuilding work, but became a buyer and improver of land, which was to put the college in a favourable situation in the time of expansion after 1944.² The closure of the Home and Colonial College brought the offer of an additional thirty places and a donation of £16,000 to St. Mary's Cheltenham, which enabled the college to purchase a site for expansion without taking out a loan. The site, Fullwood Park, was initially developed for recreation and fieldwork.³ The Mayor Report in 1929 described the acquisition of additional land as 'perhaps the most valuable work done to improve the premises of the Church Training Colleges since the War', and was happy that half the colleges were no longer on cramped sites.⁴

Saltley set about producing better accommodation for individual study, and in 1928 was able to undertake building, with a £10,000 mortgage and £10,000 covered by Governors' guarantees.⁵

-
- 1 ED 115/9 Report of Inspection at the Diocesan Training College, Exeter, November 1924. Public Record Office.
 - 2 J.L. Bradbury (1975) Chester College, 1839-1975, p. 189.
 - 3 E.B. Challinor (1978) The Story of St. Mary's College, Cheltenham, p. 47.
 - 4 Central Board of Finance: Report on the Church of England Training Colleges for Teachers, R.G. Mayor, 1929, p. 31.
 - 5 J. Osborne (ed.) (1950) Saltley College Centenary, 1850-1950, p. 48.

Hockerill also made some progress in putting right some of the deficiencies of the buildings which had been itemised by the Wakefield Commission's architect¹, but judging from a complaint from the Principal of Chichester, attempting to renew the college heating system in 1921 and having to deal with a Committee 'which is far from keen and will shuffle if it can', not all colleges set about the task of bringing their buildings up to scratch with the same earnestness.² At Salisbury the Board of Education's Inspectors found the buildings inadequate and in need of adaptation on a large scale to meet modern needs³, and a similar situation was found at Bede in 1926, with the added complication that the buildings were considered not large enough for the number of students in residence.⁴

By contrast, the Methodist college at Southlands had provided study-bedrooms by 1922 and private study merited the name.⁵ Westminster after the war undertook a £30,000 scheme of reconstruction and re-equipment⁶, which helped to raise its adverse balance

-
- 1 G.A. Wood (1938) History of Hockerill Training College, p. 84.
 - 2 National Society, Chichester Correspondence: letter dated 21.3.1921.
 - 3 ED 115/79 Report on Salisbury Training College. Public Record Office.
 - 4 ED 115/10 Report on Bede Training College, Durham, 1926. Public Record Office.
 - 5 E. Williams (1972) The History of Southlands College, 1872-1972, p. 55.
 - 6 F.C. Pritchard (1951) The Story of Westminster College, 1851-1951, p. 133.

from £6,808 in 1922 to £30,633 in 1927. By that time Southlands had sought some more adequate accommodation in Wimbledon, to which it moved from Battersea in 1929, financing the adaptation of the large property it had acquired with a mortgage for £25,000.¹

The Board of Supervision in 1925 had assumed very wide-ranging control of developments in the Church of England colleges. It had laid down that any scheme involving capital expenditure should be submitted to it before a Governing Body became committed to any obligation. The Board also set up a General Purposes Committee to act as its representative at meetings with colleges, to investigate financial returns and to make representation with regard to grants or schemes of improvement.²

The next step was to look at the colleges as a whole, and the Church Assembly was informed in 1928 of the plan to send round to the colleges 'one of the most eminent Inspectors of the Board of Education who had retired' to look at their situation, buildings and equipment and to advise on how capital expenditure grants could be best applied in an ordered scheme, rather than under the existing system where grants were made in response to individual requests

-
- 1 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1927-28, p.18.
 - 2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 12.2.1925, p. 193. The limitations of the power of the Board of Supervision are however seen in the failure in this period to get the men's colleges to agree to charge a uniform minimum fee. £20 was recommended in 1923 and £25 four years later, when Second Year students at Winchester and York and all students at Exeter were paying less than £20. See Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 15.11.1923, p. 168, and 16.3.1927, p. 271. Low fees at some Church colleges were an attraction, but the colleges paid the penalty of a low level of expenditure.

judged on the basis of need.¹ It is clear from the debate that some dioceses, paying their quota in full, felt that colleges in their area were not getting their fair share, and Canon Partridge did not improve matters by insisting that 'the clamour of individual dioceses must give way to an ordered plan', and pleading for the Central Board and the Board of Supervision to be treated with patience.² The logic cannot be denied, but the phraseology may have been thought offensive.

The patience was needed for the 'retired Inspector' to do his work, a somewhat misleading reference to Mr. R.G. Mayor, who had been Principal Assistant Secretary at the Board of Education, in charge of Training Colleges. His retirement was followed by his appointment to the Board of Supervision in 1926, to its General Purposes Committee, and to the Finance Committee of the Central Board.³ He brought to his task his highly relevant experience, and his Report in 1929 was to mark the beginning of another episode in the central organisation of the Church of England colleges.

-
- 1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. IX, No. 3, 1928, p. 208.
 - 2 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. IX, No. 3, 1928, p. 208.
 - 3 The appointment followed an approach by Lord Grey to the President of the Board of Education, who recommended Mayor as 'an excellent fellow'. ED 24/1929 Letter from Eustace Percy, 30.4.1926. Public Record Office. Lord Grey, of Howick, was Chairman of the Central Board of Finance from 1926 and represented the financial interests of the Church Assembly on the Board of Supervision up to 1944. The partnership of Grey and Partridge was a powerful influence in training college matters.

SECTION IV

THE COLLEGES AND THE REPORT OF THE
DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE, 1925

CHAPTER 1

THE UNIVERSITY CONNECTION

'Seen in retrospect', says Gosden, 'the most important single development in the training of teachers between the two World Wars was probably the establishment of machinery linking the Training Colleges with the Universities'.¹ The setting up of this machinery was the outcome of the report of the Departmental Committee set up in 1923 to review the arrangements for the training of teachers. Its most significant recommendation was that as a means of securing the association of universities with training colleges, 'arrangements might be authorised for the establishment of joint examining boards for particular colleges or groups of colleges'.²

There had been much interest in, and discussion about, the relationship of colleges with the universities, before the setting up of the Departmental Committee, but opinion was divided as to the form the university connection should take. Some, such as the Labour Party and the T.U.C., were for absorption into new university faculties of a more general scope, designed for those who entered definitely with the idea of becoming teachers.³

1 P.H.J.H. Gosden (1972) The Evolution of a Profession, p. 266.

2 Board of Education (1925) Report of the Departmental Committee on the Training of Teachers for Public Elementary Schools, p. 108.

3 See G.S.M. Ellis (ed.) (1922) The Training of Teachers.

The N.U.T. saw the colleges as colleges of a university, but concerned only with professional work with an all-graduate entry¹, while the training colleges themselves had been seeking a connection which would not destroy their identity or role.

It is admitted that there is no evidence to show from whom the 1925 proposals for the particular form of connection originated², but their effect was to assure the colleges of a place within the expanding field of Higher Education, even though the relationship established in many cases did not go beyond contact with university representatives in a Joint Board.

It was, however, because the Church colleges feared for their identity and their role that it cannot be said that they welcomed the proposals with any degree of enthusiasm. Their own attempts at establishing relationships with universities had been making slow but steady progress. The desirability of establishing a closer contact where practicable had been argued in 1917 by the Bishop of Wakefield, in the case for the setting up of the federation of Church of England Colleges³, and had been reinforced by Mr. Mayor, attending a meeting of the Board of Supervision in 1918 and suggesting that hostels should be established for colleges near universities, to enable students

-
- 1 P.H.J.H. Gosden (1972) The Evolution of a Profession, p. 270.
 - 2 W.R. Niblett, D.W. Humphreys and J.R. Fairhurst (1975) The University Connection, p. 28.
 - 3 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter to Bishops, 12.10.1917.

to take a three-year degree with college tutorial assistance, followed by a year of professional studies.¹ Warrington had agreed, as soon as it had received the report of the Wakefield Commission, that it was desirable to move the college, and to move it to be in close touch with Liverpool University.²

Shortly after the setting up of the Board of Supervision it had been suggested that Bede seemed to present the best opportunity for a linking up of a college with a university and, after successful negotiation, the college in 1919 became a Licensed Hall of Residence, with university representation on the Governing Body and the Principal a member of the Council of the Durham Colleges. Some staff became Recognised university teachers for students in Bede and, together with the Principal, were ex-officio members of the Board of the Faculty of Arts.³ That having been achieved, Saltley was then asked to approach Birmingham with a scheme of affiliation, which met with equal success, and academic work in the college during the first year was accepted by the university as part of the work towards a degree.

The Roman Catholic college at Salford submitted its application to the Board of Education in 1919 for students to take a

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 1.10.1918, p. 24.

2 National Society, St. Katharine's Liverpool Correspondence: Letter from Rev. Morley Stephenson, 6.8.1917.

3 Council of the Durham Colleges: Minutes, 11.2.1919.

three-year degree course at Manchester, followed by a professional year at Salford¹, and the Board of Education Regulations for 1920 approved four-year courses in residential training colleges which were constituent parts of a university. Approval was given to such courses at both Bede and Saltley, and at the Roman Catholic colleges in Liverpool, Salford, Newcastle and Kensington.² Chester and Warrington, together with the undenominational Edgehill, took a Final examination held by the University of Liverpool and accepted by the Board of Education as qualifying for the Certificate, but Chester also reached agreement with the university whereby a student could spend the first and last years in the college and the remaining two years in the university. Only one student, however, had taken advantage of the arrangement.³ York had been able to arrange with Leeds a similar arrangement to that arrived at between Saltley and Birmingham University.⁴ Colleges were thus working towards a situation in which their status was enhanced, without direct university interference in their work.

The Council of Principals of Church of England Colleges resolved in 1922 that each college should solve its own problem in relation to affiliation with universities, but urged that all

1 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1919, p. 37.

2 Board of Education: Report, 1919-20, p. 64.

3 J.L. Bradbury (1975) Chester College, 1839-1975, p. 186.

4 Board of Education (1925) Report of the Departmental Committee on the Training of Teachers, p. 105.

should endeavour to ensure that they did not become mere hostels, and that the interests of their teaching staff should be protected and the tutorial work of the college staff recognised by the Board of Education as a necessary part of the training and instruction of the degree course students.¹ There was to be a proper wariness in relationship with universities, that the value and importance of the work in the colleges should in no way be diminished. Hence the attempt by the London colleges to secure affiliation with the university after the war came to nothing. An informal conference of the representatives of their Governing Bodies in 1922, held at the National Society's office, decided that it was not desirable to proceed merely on the basis of the university making itself responsible for the Final examination², and the attempts of the Cheltenham colleges to secure affiliation with Bristol foundered on the inability of the colleges to comply with the insistence that students attend a minimum number of lectures in Bristol.³ The Principal of St. Mary's was quite clear that it was not the function of universities to be responsible for the training of teachers for Elementary schools.⁴

1 Council of Principals: Minutes, 30.6.1922.

2 E.L. Hewlett (1932) 'The Work of the British and Foreign School Society in the Training of Teachers', unpublished thesis, p. 314.

3 E.B. Challinor (1978) The Story of St. Mary's College, Cheltenham, p. 43.

4 D. Humphreys (1965) The Relationship between the Training Colleges and the Universities before McNair, p. 19.

The Church colleges had viewed the setting up of the Departmental Committee with extreme caution, expecting from the terms of reference that the review would have been much more comprehensive than it actually was. The Methodist Conference in 1924 instructed its Education Committee, in view of the Departmental Committee and expecting some threat, to enquire into the situation of its colleges, especially with reference to the pooling of financial and educational resources.¹ The National Society, in a massive over-reaction to the setting up of the enquiry, expressed in a circular to former students of St. Mark's, Chelsea, and St. John's, Battersea, felt that the terms of reference raised the issue of the very existence of the Church colleges in their present form. Hence the urgency for the men's colleges to put themselves in a position to be linked up with a university and receive students preparing for degrees as internal students, and hence the need for Battersea and Chelsea, neither of which could meet this demand by itself, to amalgamate.²

The fears proved to be unjustified when, at the end of 1923, Mr. Holland, a member of the Departmental Committee, reported that although at first he had been disappointed because of the 'dead set there seemed to be against the interests of the residential Training Colleges', the witnesses had convincingly

1 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1924-25, p. 8.

2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 13, 10.10.1923, p. 408.

shown the need for their continued existence.¹ On publication of the Report the National Society expressed itself entirely satisfied that the Committee had 'fully established the great value of the services of the ordinary Training Colleges and the Church Colleges amongst them'.² The satisfaction did not, however, lessen the caution with which the colleges approached the recommendation of the Departmental Committee that there should be a closer connection with the universities.

1 General Council of the Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 11.10.1923.

2 National Society: Annual Report, 1926, p. 23.

CHAPTER 2

CIRCULAR 1372 AND THE NEGOTIATIONS:

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND COLLEGES

Circular 1372 was issued in December 1925, inviting firm proposals, in the light of the Departmental Committee's recommendation, for alternative methods of examination to replace the Final examination in academic subjects conducted by the Board of Education. The Board was anxious to get rid of its examination responsibility as quickly as possible; the Church of England authorities were anxious that matters should not be rushed.

The General Council of the Church of England Colleges, meeting for the first time since 1923 and again in what was obviously considered a time of crisis, set up a sub-committee, whose report was approved and circulated to Governing Bodies in February 1926. It was agreed that the colleges should be grouped for examination purposes round local universities, but only on condition that satisfactory arrangements for internal examinations could be made. Holland argued that the only way to ensure that the President of the Board of Education's promise, that the colleges would not be handed over to the universities bound hand and foot in the matter of examinations, would be fulfilled, was to make provision for alternative Examination Boards. The provision of these, he thought, would adequately ensure the independence promised.¹

1 General Council of the Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 13.1.1926.

Holland's alternative arrangements included proposals for Regional Examining Boards and a General Examining Board. The former would consist of equal numbers of university and college representatives, together with representatives of the Board of Education. On the General Examining Board the university representatives would be those of Oxford and Cambridge, with an equal number of college representatives and, again, representatives of the Board of Education. The General Board would be for colleges which could not make arrangements with Regional Examining Boards, and for those dissatisfied with terms offered by a local university.¹

Holland forwarded his proposals to the Board of Education and received encouragement from the Chief Inspector of Training Colleges, H. Ward, in reply. The training college Inspectors, with whom Ward discussed the proposals, were apprehensive lest a Board which was not obviously linked to some standard authority would be somewhat suspect, but Ward informed Holland that he had told the Inspectors that 'we cannot wait until local University schemes develop', and that a General Board such as proposed was sure to be needed for some colleges.²

The Inspectors' reservations were in fact shared by Ward himself. He was prepared to encourage the Board of Supervision

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 4.2.1926, p. 213.

2 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letter dated 2.2.1926.

to set up a General Board to fill a gap for a time, but he thought in fact that 'to the public eye the scheme is a private one, however distinguished the individuals may be who consent to serve on the Board'.¹ Mayor too was prepared to encourage it as an alternative, but he hoped that the normal arrangement would be of schemes based on local universities.²

Speaking to the Council of Principals in February 1926, Holland explained that his intention was to allow time for the colleges to consider with great care schemes involving local universities. The General Board would meet this need and at the same time satisfy the Board of Education's anxiety that decisions should be made soon. His main concern was to avoid the danger of the Church colleges being forced hastily into unacceptable schemes. The General Examining Board would be a way of escape, and at the same time a reminder to local universities that the colleges had an alternative choice. Holland reassured the Principals that the scheme was one of which the Board of Education approved, and one which safeguarded the autonomy of the colleges. The Principals responded with some warmth, and it was agreed that no one would commit his or her college to any local scheme before the Council was able to meet again.³

-
- 1 ED 86/14 Representations regarding Circular 1372. Minute Paper, H. Ward, 4.3.1926. Public Record Office.
 - 2 ED 86/14 Representations regarding Circular 1372. Minute Paper, R.G. Mayor, 18.3.1926. Public Record Office.
 - 3 Council of Principals: Minutes, 23.2.1926.

Considerable thought had thus been given to the matter by the Church of England colleges before the conference held in March 1926, of all parties concerned, to discuss with the President of the Board of Education the future of training college examinations and the future relationship between colleges and universities. It was adjourned until October 1926 to receive the report of a sub-committee, of which Mr. Mayor became the elected Chairman, on the way in which co-operation could best be effected. That interim report showed that the committee was working on the lines of associating training colleges and universities on a geographical basis, in eleven areas. By the time that the Church of England Principals met again in November the outline of the proposals had thus become clear and negotiations had begun.

Holland counselled, however, that no college should accept the local scheme without knowing something about schemes proposed in other areas. Such advice was prompted by his awareness of the outcome of discussions between Reading University and Culham, Chichester, Brighton and Salisbury, which he felt could only be described as disappointing. A too hasty commitment to a scheme could mean the acceptance of a less satisfactory arrangement than might be arrived at otherwise.¹ Some Governing Bodies, however, expected the General Examining Board as proposed by Holland to be ready fairly early and wished the colleges to be assured that this

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book I, 20.12.1926, p. 263.

would be so. It was then that Holland made clear that what he had proposed was not a private scheme. The colleges, and the Board of Education, who had assumed that it was a scheme to be set up by the Board of Supervision, had misunderstood. He very much hoped that colleges would be able to enter into local schemes, but if they were not satisfactory then 'the National Scheme (General Examining Board) should certainly be advanced, but in such case the Board of Education should be urged to supply a National Scheme' for any college wishing to avail itself of such an arrangement.¹

The realisation of Holland's true intent, and that there was to be no escape for the Church colleges, must have disappointed many and influenced the attitudes of the colleges to the negotiations which continued throughout 1927. No college was more disappointed than St. Luke's Exeter, which perhaps put up the most resistance to association with a university, partly because of its concern about the fate of practical subjects in such an association but also because of its unhappiness about the standard of work at University College, Exeter. In reply to Circular 1372 the college deplored the giving up of the Final examination by the Board and indicated that it had approached the General Council of the Church of England Colleges to urge upon the Board its retention.²

1 Council of Principals: Minutes, 5.11.1926.

2 ED 86/14 Representations regarding Circular 1372. Minute Paper 19.2.1926. Public Record Office.

St. Luke's continued to resist the approaches of University College, Exeter throughout 1927. The Board of Supervision expressed sympathy with the objections to the arrangement proposed by the University College, and went so far as to indicate to the Board of Education that it would support a college not able to accept a scheme. But in a letter to the college, holding out little hope that the Board of Supervision would take action, it was stressed that Exeter was the only college in the area remaining outside the scheme for the South-West Board, and an alternative scheme for one would be 'a disadvantage greater than acceptance'. The college was urged not to press opposition to the breaking point.¹

The correspondence continued, and there was obvious dissatisfaction that the Board of Supervision had not firmly stood by Holland's proposed alternative arrangements in the event of breakdown of negotiations, in spite of its protestations that unsatisfactory arrangements should not be accepted. It took a visit from Mr. Mayor in 1926, and the promise that the Board of Education Inspectors would act as external examiners, an arrangement permitted in no other scheme, to placate Exeter and bring it into the South-West Board.²

Exeter was not alone in its expectations of the Board of Supervision, for some colleges at the end of 1927 were still

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 20.2.1928, p. 43.

2 F.W. Fuller (1971) 'The History of St. Luke's College, Exeter, 1839-1970', unpublished thesis, p. 457.

expecting the Board to bring into operation a scheme that would serve colleges not linked to a university, and the Principals agreed that there was 'a grave necessity for such a scheme'.¹ The Exeter correspondence, however, makes nonsense of Holland's claim in January 1928 that his General Examining Board idea was still alive and still a possibility for both Church and L.E.A. colleges, unless he were thinking that a sufficient number of colleges finding no satisfaction in the current negotiations would encourage the Board of Education to make provision.² By this time, however, it was clear that negotiations for regional groupings with universities were going as well as the Board of Education expected and no action would be taken by the Board to provide alternative arrangements.

Seven schemes of association were submitted and received the approval of the Board of Education in 1927. These were centred on the Universities of London, Durham, Birmingham, Nottingham, Bristol, Leeds and Sheffield, and Reading.³ The London scheme included special provision for four men's colleges, St. Mark and St. John Chelsea, Westminster, St. Mary's Strawberry Hill and the undenominational Borough Road, which were all attached to University College. It was agreed that there should be no attempt by the university to interfere with the work which the colleges were doing for the London degree, but they were not to

1 Council of Principals: Minutes, 17.11.1927.

2 Council of Principals: Minutes, 5.1.1928.

3 Board of Education: Report, 1926-27, p. 55.

accept students except for university work. The Intermediate examination would be taken at the end of the first year, and candidates who failed were not to be permitted to re-sit.¹

The London scheme was the only one in which the Certificate was awarded by the university, but at the price of university control of examinations. The Board of Supervision felt that the arrangement was not all that could be desired, but recommended acceptance. The Principal of Whitelands, Miss Mercier, who had made such an impression on the Departmental Committee in defence of the college course as a training for those who were going to teach the under elevens, was prepared to 'put up with it to make a beginning of the connection with the University'.²

The remaining four schemes centred on the Universities of Wales, Manchester and Liverpool, Southampton and Exeter University College, were completed in 1928, but in general, with the universities as examining but not teaching bodies and with no reciprocal arrangements as far as staff were concerned, the schemes were

-
- 1 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1927-28, p. 9. At the Roman Catholic College at Strawberry Hill few remained, however, for the Final Third Year, much to the Principal's disappointment. The University Inspection of the College in 1930 found that the aim of the College was 'to produce men with an educated and cultured outlook, rather than to push as many men as possible through a degree examination'. See Centenary Record of St. Mary's College, Hammersmith, 1850-1925, Strawberry Hill, 1925-1950, p. 55.
 - 2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 9.11.1927, p. 28. According to her biographer, she saved the lives of the Two Year colleges and from that time was regarded as a statesman (sic) of the training college world. See L. Grier (1937) The Life of Winifred Mercier, p. 181.

somewhat of a disappointment to the National Society. It is clear, however, that co-operation in some was better than in others. That based on Nottingham seems to have led to very happy relationships between the colleges and the university. At Derby the view was that the colleges had been given considerable freedom in planning their curriculum, and benefitted from stimulating and helpful staff relationships.¹ Hockerill found its association with Nottingham both happy and fruitful and 'the result was a minor revolution in Training College work'.² Holland's misgivings about the early discussions between Reading University and Culham, Chichester, Brighton and Salisbury were found to be misplaced, for the scheme eventually agreed upon allowed for wider contact than in examining, and Chichester's experience in association with Reading was a fruitful one, 'much valued and rarely criticised'.³

There were to be many heartburnings on the way, but a start had been made on raising the status of the training colleges in general.

-
- 1 M. Dobson (1951) The First Hundred Years of the Diocesan Training College, Derby, p. 54.
 - 2 G.A. Wood (1938) History of Hockerill Training College, pp. 87-88.
 - 3 C.P. McGregor (1981) Bishop Otter College, 1839-1980, p. 154.

CHAPTER 3

THE NEGOTIATIONS: THE ROMAN CATHOLIC AND METHODIST COLLEGES

The Roman Catholic reaction to the Report of the Departmental Committee was muted. A special meeting of the Catholic Education Council was held on the publication of the Report but it is unlikely that strong expressions of hostility were to the fore, as it was decided that no decisive steps should be taken in consequence.¹ There were no doubt reservations, as individual colleges responded to invitations to enter into negotiation with their local universities, and the Council approved the London scheme in 1927 only on certain conditions. The representatives of the university on the Governing Bodies of colleges were not to be greater in number than L.E.A. representatives on the Governing Bodies of aided Secondary schools, as fixed by the Board of Education, and further provisos were that university visitation of the colleges should not lead to excessive inspection, and, not unexpectedly, that the religious side of the colleges should be quite apart from the scheme.² We may assume that the same conditions were insisted upon for the inclusion of the Roman Catholic colleges in other schemes finalised in 1927 and 1928.

1 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1925, p. 31.

2 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1927, p. 29.

In contrast, the Methodist response to the Report of the Departmental Committee was hostile and vociferous. In reply to Circular 1372, Westminster had indicated that it was indifferent to whether the Final examination was conducted by the Board or the University of London, as the great majority of its students read for degrees.¹ But the Wesleyan Education Committee viewed the matter more seriously, and saw the Report as a threat to the status of both Westminster and Southlands and the work they were doing. Westminster's successes in the London degree examinations in 1923-24 were greater than those in all other training colleges put together, and from 1924 no student was admitted who was not qualified to proceed to a university degree.²

The proposal in the Report, that two or three-year concurrent degree courses and professional training should cease to be recognised, was regarded as an attempt to put the clock back twenty-five years, and the Committee was not mollified by the suggestion that students with Intermediate examination on admission could qualify in three years by completing a degree course in two years, followed by a year of professional training, for this was seen as unhelpful to Westminster's position. London it was thought, would insist on a three-year course apart from a professional year and thus, if implemented, the Report would rob the

1 ED 86/14 Representations regarding Circular 1372. Minute Paper 19.2.1926. Public Record Office.

2 F.C. Pritchard (1951) The Story of Westminster College, 1851-1951, p. 138.

college of its well-qualified entrants who were able to gain a degree and professional training in three years instead of four, and from having the pick of candidates the college would have only those who were unable through lack of means to secure a university education. The suggestion that colleges should use a third year of training for University Diploma work might, it was felt, meet with some response in the women's colleges, but the men would refuse to look at such a substitute for a degree as not worth the expense involved.¹

Southlands too would be affected, for alone among the women's colleges in London it presented students each year for the Intermediate examinations of the university. The Committee felt that unless there could be a guarantee that there would be no interference with this arrangement the result would be disastrous, both for the status of the college and from the point of view of the best interests of the students.²

The Education Committee noted with approval that the N.U.T. representatives on the Departmental Committee had refused to sign what they termed 'a most reactionary document', which would create two classes of college, those offering a four-year course and those confined to two. And as negotiations got under way for the formation of the Joint Boards, the Committee expressed its reservations about the danger of different standards prevailing in different areas, according to the status of the university

1 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1925-26, p. 12.

2 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1926-27, p. 18.

involved. A uniform standard of Certification would no longer be possible, and attention was drawn to the situation believed to exist at Exeter University College, where the majority of students, it was claimed, 'are not even matriculated'.¹ This does help to explain the reluctance of St. Luke's to join the South-West Board.

Particular concern, however, was expressed about the situation in London where it would be impossible to treat the twenty-two colleges concerned as a homogenous group. To link up colleges which devoted themselves to Cookery, with those taking students through Honours courses, would be from the university standpoint, said the Committee, absurd. For the men's colleges in London there was only one way out. They should, insisted the Committee, be treated as a class apart or decline to enter into an arrangement which would destroy their present status.² Southlands, it was decided, should consider the advantages of a link not with London but with a more recently established university, where its financial contribution would count and where training college students would form a high percentage of the whole.³

The general feeling of the Committee at the beginning of 1926 was that 'the present system works well and it is a great pity that

1 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1926-27, p. 16.

2 Ibid., p. 17.

3 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1925-26, p. 16.

it had been decided to change it',¹ and it continued to express its disquiet. The lack of enthusiasm on the part of L.E.A.s and universities was noted, the Committee 'emphatically condemned the whole movement' at its meeting in November 1926, and the Joint Board arrangements continued to attract the Committee's criticism. Such provision, it was thought, would be ideal if it were to come about by slow growth, but the Board of Education was seen to be acting 'in a way that is alien to the English genius', by setting to work with a priori schemes and plans which they wanted to impose on universities and colleges.²

In the event, as we have seen, the four men's colleges, including Westminster, were treated as a class apart, but it was then insisted by Westminster that it was not possible to administer what was virtually a university college on training college grants, and it was not long before the Principal achieved the ambition he had set for the college on his appointment in 1903. Negotiations with the university and with the Board of Education culminated in an interview with the President, Lord Eustace Percy, in the spring of 1929, when it was agreed that the Board should pay increased grants to enable every student at Westminster to take a three-year internal degree course at University College, King's College, or the London School of Economics, followed by a fourth year of professional studies. Westminster was thus in a special category, a Methodist university college in the centre of London.³ The

1 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1925-26, p. 17.

2 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1926-27, pp. 15-16.

3 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1929-30, p. 12.

irony was that its recognition cost the jobs of most of the academic staff who had helped to raise the college to university rank, as tutorial work was taken over by the colleges at which the students read for their degrees.

Southlands did not ally itself with another university, and joined the London scheme, linked with Birkbeck College. It was not an unwelcome link, for it was felt that the value of the university Certificate, independently assessed, would be bound to count in the long run over against a Certificate largely assessed by the training colleges themselves.¹ There was regret that the university would no longer permit degree courses except in the case of those colleges which admitted three-year students only, but there was welcome for the exceptional provision for students entering Southlands with the Intermediate examination, who were to be permitted to proceed to Finals in two years.² The opportunities for degree work were thus severely curtailed, with a consequent effect on staffing, as at Westminster, and although few students had actually remained to complete degree courses, it was the end of a period of academic achievement at Southlands which had begun in 1900. It was perhaps the end, also, of the timetable problems and the cases of serious overwork which the degree courses had occasioned.³

1 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1927-28, pp. 16-17.

2 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1929-30, p. 20.

3 E. Williams (1972) The History of Southlands College, 1872-1972, pp. 48, 61.

The Education Committee remained regretful about the whole development, dolefully pointing out that 'only slowly will Authorities learn to discriminate between the value of a Certificate given in one part of the country, and London', and resolving that, as soon as funds permitted, the Committee would be bound to take in hand the provision in some form of university opportunities at Southlands similar to, though far more restricted than those provided at Westminster.¹

It was with such apparent lack of enthusiasm on the part of all concerned, except the Board of Education, that 'the most important single development in the training of teachers between the two World Wars'² got under way. The circumstances and the haste surrounding the establishment of the university connection did not augur well for the development of that connection beyond the examination relationship. Such development was clearly the hope of the Departmental Committee, but it was left to the later McNair Committee to comment that the hope had not been fulfilled, and to attempt to take this further.

It was the view of Mr. Holland at the end of 1928, however, that the Church training colleges were in a stronger position than ever before, with little cause to fear that there would be widespread local authority provision of colleges, and every likelihood of expansion becoming necessary as a result of a further raising of the school leaving age. Optimism was in the air.³

1 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1929-30, pp. 21-22.

2 See p. 258.

3 Council of Principals: Minutes, 9.11.1928.

PART 4

THE STRUGGLE FOR SURVIVAL, 1929-1939

SECTION 1

THE CALM BEFORE THE STORM

CHAPTER 1

THE MAYOR REPORT

The decade began full of promise for the training colleges, but the economic problems which crowded in upon the nation, and the consequent changes in Government policy, caused them great difficulties. These were overcome by the determination to survive, but the colleges were denied the breathing space they so desperately needed when, at the end of the decade, the outbreak of the Second World War presented them with a new set of problems.

For the Church of England colleges the prospects in 1929 seemed brighter than for some time, in the light of the investigation being carried out by Mr. R.G. Mayor which, it was hoped, would lead to an ordered scheme for the general improvement of their buildings and equipment. It was an investigation prompted by the conclusion reached by the Central Board of Finance and the Board of Supervision in 1928, that the colleges would be faced with considerable difficulty in financing the capital requirements needed to bring them up to standard.¹

Mr. Mayor's Report did not confine itself to comment on the material situation, but from the vantage point of his position as the recently retired Principal Assistant Secretary at the Board of Education, Mayor took the opportunity to comment on wider issues, encouraged no doubt by the 1925 Departmental Committee Report.

1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XI, No. 1, 1930, p. 195.

He was in favour of some real extension of university influence and the university atmosphere to the training colleges, but he saw this influence in terms of the provision of an education no less liberal in spirit than that experienced at university. He saw no reason to advocate the siting of colleges near universities, because the concentration of all training in a few large centres would not, he felt, be a gain as far as the practical side of the work was concerned. It was therefore not to be regretted that most Church of England colleges, unlike those of the Roman Catholic and Methodist communities, were in smaller areas of population. Neither did he suggest that colleges should give more attention to work for degrees than they had done in the past. For the most part, he suggested, the colleges would find a more useful field for their activities in other directions, and particularly in developing practical courses of training.¹

Mayor's main concern, however, was with material provision, and the optimism of the time is reflected in the Report. All the colleges reported that they had many more applications than vacant places. There was no difficulty in finding posts for their students, and the Burnham salary scales, and the prospects of further demand for teachers in consequence of school reorganisation after the Hadow Report of 1926, were thought to make it likely that the favourable recruitment position of the colleges would continue.²

1 Central Board of Finance: Report on the Church of England Training Colleges for Teachers, R.G. Mayor, 1929, p. 17.

2 Ibid., p. 18.

Thus all the colleges were urged to prepare comprehensive schemes aimed at meeting the criticisms made by the Wakefield Commission in 1916, or in subsequent reports of Inspectors. Mayor urged that the improvement of buildings, particularly the sleeping accommodation, was a more pressing need than a systematic attempt to improve the standard of equipment. He saw the replacement of dormitories by study-bedrooms as a priority, putting accommodation on the same level as that provided by universities and L.E.A. colleges, but equally important as contributing to a liberal education and to personal development, by giving students the chance to work alone. He was aware that some Principals were opposed to such provision, fearful of the consequences of such privacy, and it was perhaps in the light of their fears that he recommended study-bedroom provision for half the students, i.e., those of the second year.¹

Mayor had also to allay fears aroused by the Departmental Committee view that the optimum size of a college was 200 students, and that the authorities should therefore consider the closure of small institutions. He did not accept that figure, and saw no need to go beyond 150 to secure a viable working unit. He recognised that the amalgamation of St. Mark's and St. John's and the closure of the Home and Colonial College had enabled other colleges to benefit, but made no recommendation for further amalgamations or closures. With the bitterness

1 Central Board of Finance: Report on the Church of England Training Colleges for Teachers, R.G. Mayor, 1929, p. 50.

aroused by such moves very much in mind, he stressed that 'the importance of the feelings of affection of old students is greater than probably would be supposed by those who do not know the colleges well'.¹

Mayor found it necessary to assure the colleges that they would all be treated alike. He defended the total commitment of the Central Board of Finance to the provision of the new Whitelands and Warrington, on the grounds that those schemes were matters of urgency, involving removal to a new site and the need to maintain two important colleges. The resentment expressed by the Principal of Exeter in 1932 at that expenditure, to the detriment of the provincial colleges in his view, was a resentment which must have been felt, if perhaps not quite so strongly, in other provincial colleges.² Mayor hastened to say, 'I see no good reason for singling out one college for being so specially important that it should be assisted from central funds in preference to the rest'.³

His visits to the colleges showed that substantial improvements were needed in the case of all the colleges not dealt with under Scheme I, except St. Paul's Cheltenham, St. Hild's and

1 Central Board of Finance: Report on the Church of England Training Colleges for Teachers, R.G. Mayor, 1929, p. 40.

2 See F.W.T. Fuller (1971) 'The History of St. Luke's College, Exeter, 1839-1970', unpublished thesis, vol. 2, p. 498.

3 Central Board of Finance: Report on the Church of England Training Colleges for Teachers, R.G. Mayor, 1929, p. 45.

St. Gabriel's, 'if they are to be brought up to the standard of efficiency which a Training College will need if it is to maintain its ground in the future'.¹ In the case of Culham and of Brighton, expenditure was not thought justified while the colleges remained on their present sites, though some improvements were thought possible.

For other colleges the recommendation was that the respective Governing Bodies should be responsible for preparing a scheme to be approved by the Board of Supervision. The responsibility for carrying out the scheme was to rest with the Governors, who would raise a loan to enable them to do this, on the security of the property. From central funds each college would receive annually a fixed proportion of the loan charges incurred, and the remainder would come from fee income or a local source. It was urged that any improvement scheme should be planned as a whole, and that where a Governing Body was not in a position to undertake a comprehensive scheme, minor improvements necessary for ensuring the immediate efficiency of the college should be undertaken.²

This investigation, the first since that of the Wakefield Commission in 1916, did put heart into the colleges, and the Report gave hope that the Church at large would turn its attention to their needs.

1 Central Board of Finance: Report on the Church of England Training Colleges for Teachers, R.G. Mayor, 1929, p. 34.

2 Ibid., p. 49.

CHAPTER 2

HOPEFUL SIGNS

The hope of a wider interest being taken in the affairs of the colleges was not ungrounded, for in 1929 was presented also the Report of the Commission which had been set up by the Church Assembly in 1924, under the chairmanship of Sir Henry Hadow, to enquire into the position of religious education in the education system.

The Commission showed a firm recognition of the importance of the colleges. The supply of teachers was declared to be the most valuable educational work the Church could do, and the quality of their life and training to be of the utmost importance to the Church and to the religious teaching given in schools. Hence the Commission affirmed, 'in a concentration of effort on all schemes which have as their aim the inspiration and training of teachers we find the great hope of the future'.¹

Behind this concern for the concentration of educational interest on the training of teachers was the recognition, as the Bishop of Liverpool made clear in presenting the Report to the Assembly, that the teaching office of the Church was no longer confined to the clergy and to teachers in Church schools, but

1 Church Assembly: Minutes of Proceedings, Autumn 1929, Report of the Commission on Religious Education, C.A. 301, p. 147.

was more and more being committed to men and women who might find themselves in a wide variety of teaching situations.¹

The fulfilment of the colleges' hope that a wider concern would be shown depended, however, as the Commission stressed, on the acceptance by the Church of the duty to promote the development of all the colleges, and that meant the provision of additional finance. The Church was urged to take action to remove the reproach that 'ever since the colleges were founded ... a low standard of expenditure had been enjoined on them which has hampered their usefulness'.²

The Report of the Commission is, as we shall see, of first moment for its suggestions for administrative changes which were to lead to an enlargement of the role of the National Society. The Commission itself, however, described as 'the heart and focus' of the Report its urging of a more generous provision for the colleges.³

The publication of the Mayor Report and the Report of the Commission coincided with the beginning of activity consequent upon the announcement by the Labour Government of its intention to raise the school-leaving age to 15 from 1 April 1931.⁴ The future looked bright for those colleges which could respond to

1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. X, No. 3, 1929, p. 499.

2 Church Assembly: Minutes of Proceedings, Autumn 1929, Report of the Commission on Religious Education, C.A. 301, p. 161.

3 Ibid., p. XVI.

4 Education in 1929: Report of the Board of Education, p. 1.

the Board of Education's invitation to admit as many additional students in 1929 as could properly be accommodated. The Board of Supervision urged colleges to respond, provided that no serious capital expenditure was incurred, and 322 additional places, an increase of 16%, were provided.¹

The original invitation made clear that a temporary increase was envisaged for 1929-1931², but when the invitation was repeated in November 1929, for the period 1930-1932, the Board of Education, aware of the provision the colleges were making, indicated its willingness to consider proposals which involved recognition for a more extended period.³ The increases at St. Paul's Cheltenham, Whitelands, York, Exeter and Lincoln were approved for a period of five years.⁴ In July 1930, the Board of Education went further and, having had discussions with Lord Grey, Chairman of the Central Board of Finance, and Mr. Holland about improvement schemes then being considered, offered permanent recognition of the increased

-
- 1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 24.10.1929, p. 106. A total of 884 additional students was admitted to two-year courses in 1929 (Education in 1930: Report of the Board of Education, p. 205) and there was an increase of 510 on the 1928 total admitted in 1930, (Education in 1931: Report of the Board of Education, p. 183) of which the Church of England colleges provided places for 166. (National Society: Annual Report, 1930, p. 19).
 - 2 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letter to colleges dated 19.7.1929.
 - 3 National Society: Annual Report, 1930, p. 19.
 - 4 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letters dated 9.1.1930, 11.6.1930, 2.7.1930.

numbers, 193 men and 238 women, as soon as the new buildings were completed. Such was the anticipated need, however, that it was indicated at the same time that, when schemes were completed, the Board would be willing to consider applications for the recognition temporarily of students in excess of the revised numbers at any college.¹

These events formed the background to the discussion of the Mayor Report in 1929 and 1930, and undoubtedly influenced that discussion. The knowledge that there would be a considerable increase in income from the additional students was a not inconsiderable factor in the decisions which were made about improvement schemes.

The discussion of the Mayor Report began in the Board of Supervision in November 1929, when it was received and adopted, and it was announced that the Central Board of Finance and the Board of Supervision would confer with the colleges individually in the following months, after which a general scheme would be drawn up.² The interviews were held at the National Society's office, to see how far each college could wisely go in embarking upon improvements and enlargement with the prospect of paying for them within twenty years, and were completed by May 1930. As a result of those interviews it emerged that only six colleges were in a position to service the loans required, without additional

1 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letter dated 2.7.1930.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 1.11.1929, p. 109.

help. The colleges were York, St. Katharine's Tottenham, the two Durham colleges and the two in Cheltenham.¹ In the case of St. Hild's, Durham, the mood of optimism and the college's financial position were such that the Governors were advised to apply for permanent recognition for 152 students instead of 130, and to build a study-bedroom block for twenty, financed without a capital appeal of any kind.²

The general scheme then drawn up was presented to the General Council in July 1930, its first meeting since 1926, but not before Lord Grey and Mr. Mayor had attempted, unsuccessfully, to get an assurance from the Board of Education that the current rate of grant, which together with fee income put the colleges in a position to contemplate repaying loans out of income, would be continued for a period.³ The original estimate of £680,000 capital cost of the improvement schemes had been reduced to £500,000, recognising that the full proposals could not be carried out, and the plan to provide the capital for loans to colleges was to be put to the Church Assembly later in the year. The loans would be serviced by the colleges themselves as much as possible and by the Assembly, which would make available the sum of not more than £11,000 per annum.

-
- 1 General Council of the Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 28.7.1930.
 - 2 Interviews with Governing Bodies: St. Hild's, 27.2.1930, pamphlet. College of St. Hild and St. Bede Archives.
 - 3 ED 24/1929 1926-31 Reconditioning of Church of England Colleges and loans for Church Training Colleges Measure 1931. Memorandum from Lord Grey, 27.5.1930. Public Record Office.

It was to be a general improvement scheme. Thus the colleges needing assistance to finance loans would each receive an equal fixed grant annually, which would take 30% of the amount available. There would be a reserve fund allowance and then the remainder would be divided according to need. Thus each college would receive from the Assembly a basic amount plus a variable amount in accordance with need, modified by any abnormal administrative costs so that those with higher costs would not benefit at the expense of others. The principle of fairness made it necessary that dioceses should not be approached by any college with a request that it should receive special treatment in the allocation of diocesan funds. The scheme of reconditioning was to be dealt with as a whole, under a Scheme II Committee representative of the Board of Supervision and the Central Board of Finance.¹

The whole matter came before the Church Assembly for a decision at its autumn session in 1930, when approval was sought for the Central Board of Finance to raise the money required in a single operation. It was fortunate perhaps that the debate was preceded by the acceptance of a motion that all available steps should be taken to give effect to the recommendations of the Commission on Religious Education, which had been strong in support of the colleges.² There was, however, an awareness in the debate that the Church was losing control of the school situation as more

1 General Council of the Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 28.7.1930.

2 Church Assembly: Minutes of Proceedings, Autumn 1930, Minute 467, C.A. 338.

and more local authority schools were built, and that from the point of view of the provision of religious education the centre of importance was moving away from the school to the teacher.

Earl Grey made great play of the Board of Education's considerable goodwill towards the Church colleges, which had been shown by its sanctioning of the enlargement and improvement schemes in July, and which he was anxious should not be endangered by reluctance on the part of the Assembly to act. He was anxious, too, that the whole weight of the Church should be seen to be behind the determination to improve the colleges. The Archbishop of Canterbury, taking his cue from Lord Grey, quoted the report of the Board of Finance to the effect that 'a tide has now risen which had to be taken or it would be missed, and once missed would be lost for ever'.¹

The Assembly gave its unanimous approval to the Central Board's plans, and was perhaps helped to make up its mind by the challenge thrown out by one speaker describing the urgency of the situation at Ripon, where one wing had been condemned and £12,000 was needed immediately. It was claimed that if the diocese had still been in possession of resources which 'at the request of the Board of Finance it had surrendered' the problem would speedily have been dealt with. It was now up to the Board, declared the speaker, to demonstrate that 'central responsibility was at least

1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XI, No. 3, 1930, p. 519.

as efficient as local responsibility would have been in such circumstances'.¹ The Assembly's unanimity, however, may be equally well explained as owing something to Lord Grey's assurance that the Assembly itself would not be called upon to give more financial help than it had been giving for the last few years.²

The Board of Finance then set about discharging that central responsibility, and turned to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to provide the necessary money to finance the improvement schemes. The Board of Education expressed its satisfaction that the arrangement would enable the schemes to go ahead, and the necessary Parliamentary approval was given in 1931 for the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to make money available for such a purpose, either to the Board of Finance or, at its request, to individual colleges.³ The Board of Education recognised that the Church colleges were taking on a necessary work for the country, that the cost of providing new colleges had been too formidable an undertaking for L.E.A.s to face since the war, and that there was little prospect of their undertaking substantial expansion.⁴ The Board was satisfied, therefore, that the justification of the schemes did not rest on the proposal to raise the

-
- 1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XI, No. 3, 1930, p. 514.
 - 2 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vo. XI, No. 2, 1930, p. 238.
 - 3 Church Assembly: Minutes of Proceedings, Spring 1931, Minute 158, C.A. 346.
 - 4 In 1930 there were 21 L.E.A. colleges, only one more than in 1914. (Education in 1930: Report of the Board of Education, p. 201).

school-leaving age. Nevertheless its own position was safeguarded by the explicit assertion that, in the event of any general reduction in the supply of teachers being found necessary at any time, the colleges would have to bear their share of the general reduction.¹

Central responsibility having been accepted by the colleges and the Assembly, all seemed set fair for its exercise in the implementation of the enlargement and improvement schemes. But Lord Grey in 1930 had spoken of 'a certain amount of uncertainty in the educational world' which made it advisable not to move too quickly.² That uncertainty was before long seriously to affect the implementation of the schemes and to lead to severe questioning of such measure of central control of the Church of England colleges as had been achieved.

-
- 1 ED 24/1929 Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Loans for Church Training Colleges Measure 1931. Notes for Speech, undated. Public Record Office.
 - 2 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XI, No. 2, 1930, p. 238.

SECTION II

THE STORM

CHAPTER 1

HOPE DEFERRED

In February 1931 the House of Lords rejected Sir Charles Trevelyan's Education Bill, the third introduced since 1929, which included provision for the raising of the school-leaving age. The effect of this on the need for additional teachers was obvious, but so also was the realisation that a decline in the school population would begin in 1934, which would involve a reduction even by 1935 of about 350,000 pupils.¹ But economy was in the air on other grounds, with the appointment of the May Committee on National Expenditure in March 1931, and education was expected to have to bear its share of the economies. Thus the training colleges became what the National Society described as 'the very plaything of circumstances'.²

The initial reaction of the Board of Education to the failure to secure the raising of the school-leaving age was a fairly reassuring one. In a letter to the Board of Supervision, it was pointed out that local authorities had made considerable progress in reorganisation of schools since 1926 and a substantial number of teachers would be required. The prospects, however, were not as good as they might have been, and colleges were invited to leave their remaining vacancies for 1931 open. At all

1 Education in 1932: Report of the Board of Education, p. 53.

2 National Society: Annual Report, 1933, p. 30.

costs, it was urged, steps should be taken to combat anxiety about unemployment of teachers, which could affect recruitment for many years. In a following letter the further reassurance was given that nothing had happened 'to affect our general approval of your programme of rebuilding and enlargement'.¹ The question had been raised in the Board of Education as to whether the opportunity should be taken to discontinue altogether some of the colleges in the poorest condition, but this had been rejected on the ground that L.E.A.s, who were 'not inclined to maintain Training Colleges under the present grant system', would be unlikely to replace the facilities lost.²

The invitation to the colleges to consider leaving their remaining vacancies open was clearly not sufficiently strong, and few intending students withdrew in fear of unemployment at the end of training. Hence admissions in 1931 exceeded the 1928 total by about 1,200, and there was no noticeable reduction on the total of those who had been in training in 1930-31. Severer measures were necessary, and the Board of Education notified the colleges that the approval of additional places for 1931-32 would not be renewed for 1932-33, and that where additional places had not been provided for 1931-32 a general reduction of 2½% would be required.³ The Board was still treating the matter cautiously,

1 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letters dated 26 and 27.3.1931.

2 ED 24/1929 Minute Paper A.P. Oppé for Mr. Pelham, 10.3.1931. Public Record Office.

3 Education in 1931: Report of the Board of Education, p. 47.

and admitted that 'something much larger could probably have been justified'.¹

By the following year that 'something much larger' had become necessary. Again exercising its customary courtesy, the Board of Education informed Mr. Holland in 1932 that it was considering a 10% reduction and invited him to discuss it.² Circular 1420 was issued in August, ordering such a reduction for 1933 on the numbers approved for 1932-33. The end, however, was not yet in sight, and the marked decline in the school population which was expected to reduce the demand for teachers even further in 1936 led to the publication of Circular 1430 in July 1933, ordering for 1934 a reduction of 8% on the total numbers approved for entry in 1933.³

This overall reduction of 20% in the expected numbers of students caused consternation in the colleges, the Board of Supervision and the Central Board of Finance. The loss of each student represented a loss of something like £100 in fees and grant, and yet Lord Grey in 1931 had assured the Church Assembly that the colleges themselves out of their yearly surplus would be able to provide nearly two-thirds of the money necessary to re-equip and recondition, 'if calculations turned out to be anything like correct'.⁴

1 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letter dated 21.12.1931.

2 Ibid., letter dated 17.6.1932.

3 Education in 1933: Report of the Board of Education, p. 55.

4 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XII, No. 2, 1931, p. 233.

Even before the announcement of the 2½% cut in December 1931, the Central Board of Finance had decided that building involving a large loan should not be started after October 1931, in view of the uncertainty about future numbers after the change of Government in August. Some improvements had by that time been successfully completed at Brighton, Saltley, Norwich, Truro, Winchester and York.¹ Major building work at Ripon, Chichester and Hockerill, where contracts had been entered into, was permitted to continue but progress was permitted elsewhere only where the college was in a strong financial position or there was a small amount of expense involved. 'It would be a very rash man', said Lord Grey early in 1932, 'who said that the economy of the Board of Education had reached its limits'.² The plans of five colleges were suspended altogether, but the work completed provided a total of 100 additional places.³

The colleges did not immediately see the seriousness of the situation. All were urged by the Board of Supervision to raise their fees, to £35 for men and £40 for women. Exeter and York would not go beyond £30, and Winchester £32. The women's colleges would not go beyond £35, and St. Hild's raised its fees only to £30. The attempt to secure more economic management in the matter

-
- 1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XII, No. 3, 1931, p. 12.
 - 2 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XIII, No. 1, 1932, p. 189.
 - 3 ED 86/60 1932-35 Church of England, discussions with Board of Supervision. Notes on Church of England Training Colleges, 27.7.1932. Public Record Office.

of catering and the purchase of general supplies met with a similarly half-hearted response. The offer by the Central Board of Finance to give expert advice on corporate buying met with nine responses in favour, ten refusals and silence from the remainder. Exeter, ever willing to assert its independence, was 'not in favour of further steps in the direction of centralisation in the administration of Church colleges' and Peterborough deprecated what was judged to amount to a proposal to appoint a financial adviser to the colleges.¹

The Board of Supervision, however, made a much more grave assessment of the situation after the proposal for a 10% reduction was privately communicated to Mr. Holland in June 1932. The officers realised that the effects of any attempt to secure greater economies, such as those attempted, even if successful, would be merely cosmetic in terms of solving the problems of the colleges. They were ready with their own radical solution in line with the Board of Education's wish to secure an overall decrease, but also with its declared willingness to consider proposals for a varying amount of reduction within a group of colleges.²

In July 1932 Lord Grey requested Lord Irwin, the newly appointed President of the Board of Education, to receive a deputation from the Central Board and the Board of Supervision, 'a body recognised by the Board of Education as representative of

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 3.1.1932, pp. 187-9.

2 Board of Education: Circular 1420, 4.8.1932.

the Church Training Colleges and authorised to advise on matters relating to them'.¹ This was followed by a letter from Grey to Pelham, the Secretary of the Board, affirming the Central Board's anxiety to co-operate with the Board of Education but pointing out that, if the grants were cut in exact proportion to the number of places lost, the whole machinery of the colleges would be hopelessly crippled.² The deputation was received by Lord Irwin on 3rd August, but the scheme to be presented by the deputation 'to deal with the threatened bankruptcy of the colleges', the details of which were known outside the deputation only to the Archbishop of Canterbury, were forwarded in a letter from Lord Grey at the end of July.

This important document shows that the plan originally devised was much more radical than that which led to so much controversy when it was made public towards the end of the year. The deputation suggested that either the cuts in grant to colleges should not be in direct ratio to the cut in places, or some colleges should be closed temporarily, their students redistributed and payment of grant readjusted accordingly. Five such closures were proposed. The closure of Culham and Chester, together with Brighton, Lincoln and Truro, would bring the total of places remaining nearer the approved 1931-32 numbers, upon which all the calculations for the

1 ED 86/60 Letter dated 16.7.1932. Public Record Office. As Edward Wood, Lord Irwin had been President of the Board of Education 1922-24. He returned to the Office in 1932-35, and succeeded his father as Lord Halifax in 1934.

2 ED 86/60 Letter dated 23.7.1932. Public Record Office.

efficient financing of the colleges had been based. The fact that closure would be temporary was to be stressed, in order to avoid 'such a revulsion of feeling as would induce strenuous opposition to our proposals in the Church at large'. The deputation correctly judged the strength of feeling it was possible to arouse on the question of college closures.¹

Other papers in connection with the deputation show that the immediate reaction of the Board was to welcome the proposal, as having much to commend it from an educational point of view, and there was admiration that at short notice constructive proposals had been put forward, 'and proposals moreover that required some courage to put forward at all'.² But as the full measure of the assurances for which the Board of Supervision was asking became clear, there was a drawing back. The Board had requested not only £10,000 for one year in compensation to staff of closing colleges, but also an annual payment to reserve of £9,000 for improvements when the colleges reopened. The Board of Supervision regarded itself as committed to the 1930 scheme and based its calculations on the increased numbers for which the colleges would have been recognised had the enlargements been completed. The Board of Education regarded this as a spurious exercise because those enlargements had not been completed, and asserted that the situation which had warranted the proposed increases, i.e. the proposed

-
- 1 ED 86/60 Letter from Grey to Pelham, 29.7.1932. Public Record Office.
 - 2 ED 86/60 Minute Paper for President, 29.9.1932. Public Record Office.

raising of the school-leaving age, had now passed, losing sight of the fact that the increases had been approved on other grounds.¹

A further problem was that neither side wished to take the initiative in bringing about closure. Canon Partridge suggested that the Board of Education should insist on Concentration and throw on the Board of Supervision the responsibility for carrying it out, and the Archbishop of Canterbury intervened to say that it would be invidious to make the Board of Supervision suggest such a policy. The Board of Education's view, however, was that if the closure were to be in their hands they could not justify closing as many as five colleges against opposition. They suggested a fresh scheme, omitting Chester and Truro from the closure list, and leaving the surviving colleges in the 1928-29 position in regard to numbers, but with little margin out of which to meet any further cuts which might become necessary.² As late as October 1932, representatives of the Central Board and the Board of Supervision were pressing reluctant officials of the Board of Education to agree to the closure of five colleges, but were perhaps dissuaded by the Board's argument that to close five would put the remaining colleges in such a healthy financial position that the continuation of grant at the existing rate would not be justified. The recorded comment, however, is that 'the Church representatives were not convinced'.³

-
- 1 ED 86/60 Minute Paper, 26.9.1932. Public Record Office.
 - 2 ED 86/60 Minute Paper A.P. Oppé, 22.9.1932. Public Record Office.
 - 3 ED 86/60 Interview Memorandum, 21.10.1932. Public Record Office.

No official consultation had taken place with any college before or since the publication of Circular 1420 on 4th August, although the Chairman of the Board of Supervision spoke in the Church Assembly in 1933 of 'soundings taken in Training College circles'.¹ There was no full meeting of the Board of Supervision between 7th July and 3rd November. The policy of Concentration had been decided by a small group of officials of the Board of Supervision and the Central Board of Finance, to ensure the economic health of the remaining colleges and their ability to meet their liabilities. The choice of colleges for closure clearly rested on the fact that none of them had received a grant for improvement from the Central Board and they were thus not at the stage of servicing loans.² The reaction from the colleges, when it eventually came, was a display of resentment not only against the authorities concerned in the matter but against the whole centralising tendency of the administration of the colleges. It is not too difficult to envisage the reaction which would have resulted had the original, radical solution to the colleges' difficulties been made public.

-
- 1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XIV, No. 1, 1933, p. 126.
 - 2 ED 86/60 Minute Paper from Legal Branch, 19.8.1932. Public Record Office.

CHAPTER 2

A CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE

Circular 1420 was issued on 4th August, 1932, and the Board's intention to effect a 10% reduction in admissions made public. Mr. Holland met Mr. Pelham on 6th August to discuss temporary closures. Pelham reiterated that each group of colleges could be considered as a unit, and accepted that some form of special assistance should be given to tide colleges over a difficult period. Holland accepted, however, that the Board at the time had no power to require a college to close, or to enforce closure by complete withdrawal of grant.¹

The outcome of the meeting was the drawing up of draft Regulations, for insertion in the Regulations for the Training of Teachers, giving the Board such powers. These were communicated to Mr. Holland in October and reported by him in confidence to the General Purposes Committee of the Board of Supervision at its meeting on 27th October. Articles 3(c) and 23 of the Regulations were to enable the Board of Education to suspend or terminate recognition of a college and adjust the numbers at other colleges of the same type, and to pay a 'relief grant' for the year 1933-34 to assist non-provided colleges to meet financial difficulties arising from the reduction in the number

1 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: Notes of Meeting, 6.8.1932.

of students. The Regulations would also provide machinery for collecting contributions towards the expenses involved in closing a college from other colleges belonging to the group, a 'contributory grant' justified on the ground that colleges postponing their building schemes would have substantial surpluses and therefore be in a position to help other colleges.¹

It was not until that meeting of the General Purposes Committee in October that it was decided that the whole matter should be opened up and that a meeting should be called of the General Council, representative of all the colleges.²

At the meeting of the Board of Supervision on 3rd November it was assumed that Concentration was a necessity and the new Chairman, Sir Walter Riddell³, Mr. Mayor and Mr. Holland were left to settle the agenda for the General Council.⁴ The intention was clearly that the meeting should give its approval to what had already been decided, that Concentration was inevitable.

The draft Regulations were published in Circular 1423 on 9th November, and a letter from Mr. Pelham to Mr. Holland of the same date constituted the official expression of the Board's view

1 Board of Education: Circular 1423, 9.11.1932.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 27.10.1932, p. 185.

3 Sir Walter, Principal of Hertford College, Oxford, and Treasurer of the Board, succeeded Bishop Eden.

4 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 3.11.1932, p. 187.

that the economical, and educationally the most satisfactory, way of effecting the required reduction in the number of places would be by means of temporary closure of some colleges. The Board of Supervision was invited to make suggestions as to the names of colleges to be closed.¹ Little wonder then that the General Council, at its meeting later in November, announced its support for the policy of Concentration and issued a statement that in the view of the meeting all colleges as a matter of course would co-operate to the fullest possible extent.²

That, however, was before the announcement of the names of the colleges to be closed, at a special meeting of the Board of Supervision on 25th November. Of the two men's colleges which had earlier been mentioned, Chester was chosen for closure. Perhaps Lord Grey's earlier expressed fears, that the High Church Governing Body of Culham would strenuously protest if their students were dispersed to Low Church colleges, had been taken note of.³ The more likely reason was, however, that Chester, in a heavily populated area, would have less difficulty in reopening than Culham.⁴ The reason given to the Bishop of Chester by Riddell was that the General Council's insistence that the Board should consider the value of small colleges and colleges in outlying

-
- 1 ED 24/1934 Economy Measures, Church of England Colleges. Letter dated 9.11.1932. Public Record Office.
 - 2 General Council of the Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 24.11.1932.
 - 3 ED 86/60 Interview Memorandum, 21.10.1932. Public Record Office.
 - 4 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 19.1.1933, p. 218.

districts had had a distinct influence on the retention of Culham.¹ The choice of Chester was not welcomed by the Board of Education. At an interview with Mr. Holland on the same day as the Board of Supervision's special meeting, the Secretary pointed out that the closure would mean the loss of more places than a 10% reduction over all the men's Church of England colleges.²

Of the women's colleges Lincoln was selected for closure, together with Fishponds, and not Brighton which had been an earlier choice. The colleges were immediately informed by telegram from Canon Partridge, an action later described in the Church Assembly as 'a gross act of discourtesy' and 'the last word in insolent bureaucracy'.³ An unfortunate choice of means dictated the peremptory tone of its content.

The Minutes of the meetings of the Board of Supervision held in November and December reflect the efforts of the three colleges concerned to have the decision reversed. The hearing of their case by the Board of Supervision, insisted upon by the General Council before official communication was sent to the Board of Education, took place on 29th November. The college representatives pleaded in each case that there were special reasons why they ought not to have been selected, but their

1 ED 86/60 Letter dated 30.11.1932. Public Record Office.

2 ED 86/60 Interview Memorandum, 25.11.1932. Public Record Office.

3 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XIV, No. 1, 1933, p. 131.

pleading was to no avail, and their view that the outcome of the meeting had already been determined would have been confirmed by a letter from the Board of Education, dated the following day, informing the colleges about their proposed closure.¹ The eliciting of the disquieting fact that the Board of Supervision could not guarantee the reopening of the colleges was hardly likely to encourage them to co-operate in what looked like the bringing about of their demise.²

Neither were they mollified by a letter from Lord Grey assuring them that they had a special claim on the goodwill and gratitude of the Church.³ The colleges wanted neither, but a 10% cut all round, and criticised the decision to close as too hasty. A deputation attended a special meeting of the Board of Supervision on 3rd December, at which Mr. Pelham was present by invitation. He spoke at length, and it must have been clear to the deputation that the Board of Education and the Board of Supervision were at one, and that their case was lost. At the meeting of the Board of Supervision on 8th December, a letter from the Bishop of Chester was read, saying that the college would not accept the closure, and asking for a meeting of the General Council to look at alternatives which had not been

-
- 1 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letter from A.P. Oppé, 30.11.1932.
 - 2 D.H.J. Zebedee (1962) Lincoln Training College, 1862-1962, p. 105.
 - 3 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 29.11.1932, p. 198.

investigated by the Board. The Board replied that they, together with the Board of Education and the Central Board of Finance, had gone into the matter as fully as possible, and that the General Council had already declared its support for Concentration, understanding that this meant closure 'in the highest interests of the group of Church of England colleges'.¹ It offered, however, to meet a further deputation, an offer prompted by Mr. Pelham on the ground that, though it might not affect the result, it would materially affect the manner in which the decision was ultimately accepted.²

Meanwhile the colleges concerned were also making representations to the Board of Education. The matter was, however, becoming an embarrassment to the Board. The secret negotiations and the close co-operation between the Church officials and officials of the Board were coming to nought, for it was clear that the Board of Supervision had misjudged the willingness of the colleges to co-operate. Mr. Pelham sought an assurance from the Bishop of Manchester that if the Board of Supervision did not change its mind, Chester would not make further representations to the Board of Education. Lincoln had given such an assurance.³

-
- 1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 8.12.1932, p. 203.
 - 2 ED 86/60 Letter to Sir W.B. Riddell, 7.12.1932. Public Record Office.
 - 3 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letter dated 9.12.1932.

A warning shot was also fired by the Board in the notification that if no Church colleges closed the primary justification for 'relief grant' would have disappeared.¹

A further joint deputation was received by the Board of Supervision on 29th December, but the Board was unanimous that there was no reason to depart from its recommendation. The colleges were immediately informed by the Board of Education that 'in these circumstances the Board feel that they have no alternative but to carry out the decision'.²

The resistance did, however, cause the Board of Supervision to issue a lengthy statement explaining the circumstances which had led to its closure decision, and for the first time criteria for selection were publicly mentioned. It was admitted that the major criterion was the position of the colleges with regard to their improvement schemes and whether they were committed to paying considerable sums annually in servicing loans. Then there was concern for fairness of treatment as between North and South, and between men and women. So two colleges had been chosen from the larger number in the South and from the larger number of colleges for women. The third criterion, it was claimed, was that the colleges selected for closure should be in localities which would offer the best chance of successful reopening after

1 ED 24/1934 Letter to Sir W.B. Riddell from E.H. Pelham, 22.12.1932. Public Record Office.

2 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letters dated 29.12.1932.

the period of suspension. In an attempt to enlist sympathy in the Church at large, the Board justified its action on the ground that to weaken every college by insisting that it should bear its share of the cut in numbers would make all colleges vulnerable to an attack from those who wished to be rid of the Voluntary presence. 'The time may come when a strong and healthy group, capable of absorbing larger numbers, may become more than ever a national asset'.¹

If anything, the statement served only to fan the flames of opposition.² The colleges could hope for no change of mind by the Board of Supervision, and thus the Church Assembly became the arena in which the contest was fought out. At the spring session of 1933 the motion for debate, in the name of the Dean of Chester, was that the Board of Supervision should postpone for twelve months the closing of any college, while all possible alternatives were explored. The danger signals were clearly to be seen, but Lord Grey was confident just before the session that if Pelham were to give an assurance that recognition would be restored in

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 19.1.1933, p. 217.

2 The published histories of Lincoln and Chester paint a vivid picture of the local and national campaigns mounted by the three colleges. They bring out in particular the resentment that it was freedom from debt which had marked them out for penalty, and the bitterness of feeling that the Board of Supervision could not be trusted to protect the interests of the provincial colleges. Lord Liverpool sweepingly criticised the Board as 'all Southerners'. See D.H.J. Zebedee (1962) Lincoln Training College, 1862-1962, p. 105; J.L. Bradbury (1975) Chester College, 1839-1975, p. 203; ED 24/1934 Letter from Lord Irwin to Lord Liverpool, 15.12.1932. Public Record Office.

three years' time if the Assembly desired it, the policy of the Board of Supervision would be endorsed. The Board of Education did not give him the assurance he sought, and would go no further than to say that in the matter of reopening they would certainly attach great weight to representations by the Assembly.¹

In the debate on the Dean of Chester's motion the financial argument for closure was easily won by the supporters of the Board of Supervision's action. Sir Walter Riddell's assertion, that not to Concentrate 'would submit the working power of the colleges to a kind of creeping paralysis',² was countered by the Bishop of Chester's contention that means could be found to keep all the colleges in existence, and by the assertions of the representatives of both Lincoln and Fishponds that they had the resources to survive a 10% cut. But Canon Partridge's financial analysis showed that to keep all the colleges in existence would mean paring to the bone the expenses of all the colleges, with consequent effects on their educational efficiency. He was quick to point out also that in spite of Lincoln's protestations about

-
- 1 ED 24/1934 Letter from Lord Grey to Lord Irwin and reply, 8.2.1933. Public Record Office. This cautious reply is in line with his view earlier expressed to Mr. Holland, that the future was too doubtful to justify any pledge. (See Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: Notes of Meeting, 6.8.1932). The suspicions of the Assembly that colleges once closed would be unlikely to reopen were perhaps justified.
 - 2 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XIV, No. 1, 1933, p. 133.

the ability to survive, the college was without a much needed art room, gymnasium and assembly hall, and had very few study-bedrooms.¹

What is undeniable, however, is that the feeling of the three colleges, that they had been treated with lack of consideration and that the Board's decision had been hasty, was widely shared, even by those who had sympathy for the Board's position. The Bishop of Chichester pointed out that 'at no other juncture in the framing of Training College policy ... had any challenge been given by the colleges as a whole to a decision which the Board of Supervision had made'.² The way in which Fishponds' complaint was expressed by the Bishop of Gloucester was an indication, however, of how little the college regarded itself as belonging to a group of Church colleges. He pointed out that the college had joined the federation in 1918 only under episcopal pressure, had not been concerned with financial arrangements made by the Central Board, had never applied for nor received help from the Board of Supervision, and had a £10,000 surplus. Indeed it felt betrayed that the assurance given in 1918, that the Board could exercise no veto or control over the College Council, had been disregarded.³

There was, however, another undeniable factor in the widespread sympathy for the three colleges. A letter written by

1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XIV, No. 1, 1933, p. 155.

2 Ibid., p. 149.

3 Ibid., p. 144.

Sir Edmund Phipps¹ of the Board of Supervision to Pelham, as the storm broke at the end of November 1932, had stated that the officials of the Central Board and Board of Supervision were already under suspicion, and especially Canon Partridge, as too bureaucratic and centralising.² Some concern had been expressed in the Assembly earlier in 1932 about the concentration of control within the Central Board in the hands of a few people. Particular concern was expressed that the quarterly report of the Central Board had not been presented to the whole Board but had been approved only by its Finance Committee.³ The issue before the Assembly in 1933 provided the opportunity for a protest vote about style of leadership. Hence Riddell's concern to stress that the Board of Supervision had not acted high-handedly or beyond its constitutional authority.⁴

The Archbishop of York, sensing the mood of the Assembly, attempted to secure an amendment which, while accepting the

-
- 1 Sir Edmund Phipps is another example of the use made by the Board of men whose careers had been in the Board of Education. He entered office in 1901, had been Private Secretary to Sir Robert Morant and ended his career as Deputy Secretary, 1926-29. Who Was Who (1952) Vol. IV.
 - 2 ED 24/1934 Letter dated 29.11.1932. Public Record Office. The writer's fear was that if Mr. Holland were also blamed for taking too much upon himself the Board of Supervision's position would be weakened for the future.
 - 3 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XIII, No. 1, 1932, p. 189.
 - 4 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XIV, No. 1, 1933, p. 123.

necessity of the Board's policy, would ensure that in future there would be full consultation with college Governing Bodies. He pointed out that 'the main question of policy was a good deal complicated by the resentment caused at the absence of such full consultation'.¹ The amendment was lost, by 217 to 161 votes, the Assembly preferring to follow the Bishop of Chester's argument that it would be worth a year's delay to enable closure, if there had to be closure, to be carried out without any ill-feeling or sense of injustice.² According to his biographer, Bishop Fisher, making his Assembly debut, put aside his doubts about the efficiency of Chester at that moment and was persuaded of its good intentions. 'He delivered his speech and won the day'.³ The argument was backed by a petition on behalf of Chester with 38,000 signatures, and one with 10,000 on behalf of Lincoln.

The most of which the Board of Supervision could fairly be accused in this matter is that it made a serious error of judgement in choosing not to take Governing Bodies into its confidence at an earlier stage. Its defence, that the delay between August and November was due to the proper activity of the Board in pursuing all the financial implications of a scheme of suspension, rings rather hollow.⁴ It may also be said that its customary willingness

1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XIV, No. 1, 1933, p. 158.

2 Ibid., p. 142.

3 W. Purcell (1969) Fisher of Lambeth, pp. 70-71.

4 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XIV, No. 1, 1933, p. 125.

to co-operate with the Board of Education led it into a decision which no other group of colleges felt compelled to make. The Board cannot, however, be accused of betraying an indifference to the interests entrusted to it, and Lord Grey felt compelled to pay tribute to Mr. Holland for the 'untold benefit' conferred on the colleges by his advocacy on their behalf with successive governments whose trust he had enjoyed.¹ Neither can it stand accused of the 'instant injustice' with which McGregor charges it.² It may have been hasty to arrive at Concentration, but no one knew in more intimate detail the affairs of the colleges, or cared more deeply for a strong and effective Church of England presence in teacher-training. To 'take the step of faith and self-sacrifice once again' in letting all the colleges take their chance, as one speaker in the debate suggested, would have been, in the Board's judgement, to undo all that had been achieved since 1925 and to threaten a future presence.³

The Board of Supervision had no constitutional responsibility to the Church Assembly, but the Assembly was the Board's paymaster and the Board had no alternative but to accept the Assembly's decision. In the eyes of the Board of Education the Assembly was now the decision maker, and that realisation marked a quite

1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XIV, No. 1, 1933, p. 170.

2 C.P. McGregor (1981) Bishop Otter College, 1839-1980, p. 164.

3 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XIV, No. 1, 1933, p. 136.

definite turning point in the relationship between the Board and the Board of Supervision. The Chairman of the latter was 'terribly mortified' at the Assembly decision and refused to inform the Board of Education, a task which had to be left to the Archbishop of Canterbury.¹ Mr. Holland expressed his confidence to Pelham that by the summer the Assembly would have seen the wisdom of the closure plan, but informed the Archbishop that he had been notified that the Regulations which would have facilitated Concentration were to be withdrawn, and that he had not been surprised to hear from Pelham that the amount of attention to the Board of Supervision's recommendations 'that we shall be able to secure ... in future will depend upon proved ability beforehand to deliver the goods'.²

The Archbishop made an unsuccessful attempt to secure suspension rather than withdrawal of the Regulations by the Board. He forwarded Holland's letter at the same time, which brought forth a disclaimer from Lord Irwin that there was any sense of annoyance at the Board of Education.³ The disclaimer is, however, nullified by Irwin's own description of the Assembly's action as 'a stupid vote, a letting down of the Board of Supervision' which nevertheless had to be taken note of.⁴

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 10.2.1933, p. 238.

2 ED 24/1934 Letter dated 17.2.1933. Public Record Office.

3 ED 24/1934 Letter dated 21.3.1933. Public Record Office.

4 ED 24/1936 Denominational Training College Papers. Relief Grant, Notes 13.2.1933. Public Record Office.

CHAPTER 3

THE COMMITTEE OF ENQUIRY

Still smarting from the Church Assembly rejection, the Chairman of the Board of Supervision reluctantly called a meeting of the General Council. In the knowledge, however, that even if the General Council adhered to its previous resolution in favour of Concentration, the Board of Education would not act in the face of the resolution by the Assembly, and had already notified the three colleges that closure would not be proceeded with¹, the Board of Supervision made no attempt to secure confirmation of its previous decision.

It proposed instead a Committee of Enquiry, to consist of fifteen members representing the Central Board, the Board of Supervision, Principals and Governing Bodies. Under its wide terms of reference it was to consider the general standard of efficiency of the colleges, and to advise whether efficiency could be secured without temporary Concentration. It was also to review the need for a scheme of development, and its cost, and look at the financial stability of the colleges.²

The General Council at its meeting in March 1933 accepted the Board's proposal, though not without an attempt to exclude

1 ED 24/1934 Letter from Lord Irwin to Archbishop of Canterbury, 11.2.1933. Public Record Office.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 28.2.1933, p. 231.

representatives of the Central Board, clearly in favour of Concentration, and Principals from the Committee. The Council went further, however, and, taking its cue from the Archbishop of York's amendment in the Assembly debate, moved that no decision affecting a college should be acted upon by the Board of Supervision, and no advice affecting a college should be given to the Board of Education, without the full consent of a Governing Body. An attempt to set up a committee to revise the Governing Body representation on the Board of Supervision was parried by the Chairman's assertion that the constitution could be altered only on the authority of the Archbishops, and that it would be 'undesirable and improper' for the Council to act without first ascertaining whether the Archbishops would wish to receive the views of the Council, and by the reminder that a proposed new Central Council of Education, then being considered by the Assembly, might involve substantial alterations in the powers and scope of the Board of Supervision.¹ The assertive mood of the Council in this meeting is in marked contrast to that of the November meeting at which the Council had accepted the Board's Concentration proposals. It passed a further resolution that the Board of Supervision should report annually to the Council, but it was left in no doubt by the Chairman of the Board's constitutional independence.²

1 See Part 4, Section III, Chapter 2.

2 General Council of the Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 13.3.1933.

Understandably perhaps, after this meeting Sir Walter Riddell resigned as Chairman of the General Council and of the Board of Supervision, and was succeeded by the Bishop of Peterborough. Under him the Committee of Enquiry, which included Lord Grey, Canon Partridge, Mr. Mayor and Sir Edmund Phipps, began its work in April 1933 and presented its report to the Board of Supervision in December. In the intervening period the representatives of each college were interviewed by the Committee, college accounts were professionally examined, and the information about buildings gathered by Mr. Mayor in 1929 was updated by means of a questionnaire sent to Principals. The intention was to gather as much information as possible. The work of the Committee was given added point by the announcement in July of the 8% reduction in numbers to be admitted in 1934.¹ The announcement led Lord Grey to assert that notwithstanding the Committee of Enquiry, the Central Board of Finance had to consider the financial implications. That consideration led him to the conclusion at which the Committee was to arrive at the end of the year, that it would be possible to maintain all the colleges for three years, after which there would either have to be Concentration or, if there was a renewed demand for teachers, the implementation of the building schemes.²

The Enquiry was also influenced by the debate in the Assembly's summer session about whether the colleges were doing the job for

1 Education in 1933: Report of the Board of Education, p. 55.

2 Board of Supervision, General Correspondence: Memorandum on Policy, Lord Grey, 20.7.1933.

which they were intended, i.e. the training of Church teachers, since there had been no regular inspection of the religious instruction in colleges since the war.¹

Hence the consideration of the general standard of efficiency in the colleges was interpreted by the Committee to mean both religious and educational efficiency. The question then to be asked was whether these would be better upheld and increased by keeping all the colleges in being, or by closing some and improving others. Not to begin with the question of buildings, but to look at the problem from another aspect which would be likely to have behind it wider Church interest, was to take the heat out of the argument about the closure of individual colleges and to lower the temperature of debate. It was a shrewd move. The Committee hoped that 'a well-defined policy for the Church Training Colleges might emerge which would govern the plans of the next two or three decades', but the furore aroused by the threatened closures made it inevitable that their proposals would include Concentration only as a last resort.²

On the question of religious atmosphere the encouraging view was taken that 'there is not much in the spirit and discipline of these institutions that is open to serious criticism'. In view of the lack of religious training in the home and inadequate religious teaching in Secondary schools, the general verdict was

1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XIV, No. 2, 1933, p. 271.

2 Church Assembly: Report of the Committee of Enquiry presented to the Board of Supervision, 6.12.1933, p. 11.

that 'Churchmen must rejoice at the high level of effort'.¹ In the reports on the individual colleges however, which contain considerable detail, in only nine cases do positive statements about the religious life and teaching in the colleges occur.²

There was no doubt in the Committee's mind about the general educational efficiency of the colleges, but the buildings were the one respect in which the situation of the colleges as a whole could be held to be worse than that of any other group.³ It was admitted that the 1934 reduction in admissions would cause further problems, but the financial considerations which might dictate a closure policy were, it was thought, outweighed 'by the disadvantages to the localities that would result from the closing of particular institutions'.⁴

Thus although the financial position of all the colleges was becoming less and less satisfactory - only eight colleges, it was decided, could survive if all were left to themselves - the Committee proposed a plan to produce sufficient income to keep them all in being, a plan involving 'a closer co-operation between the colleges than has heretofore been attempted', but for a limited period of three years.⁵ It was proposed that all colleges should

-
- 1 Church Assembly: Report of the Committee of Enquiry presented to the Board of Supervision, 6.12.1933, p. 24.
 - 2 Committee of Enquiry 1933, Minutes and Reports of Interviews: Reports attached to pp. 140-165.
 - 3 Church Assembly: Report of the Committee of Enquiry presented to the Board of Supervision, 6.12.1933, p. 26.
 - 4 Ibid., p. 38.
 - 5 Ibid., p. 43.

exercise the utmost economy, raise fees to £50 and pay half of the increase into a central pool, from which the Board of Supervision would make annual payments to colleges according to their needs. It was hoped that the Board of Education would make a contribution until the full effect of the fee increases was felt, and the Assembly was to be urged to make the £10,000 vote allocated to colleges in its budget a first charge upon the revenues, rather than a below the line charge.¹

The cost of keeping all the colleges open was to be the halting of the 1930 scheme for general improvement and enlargement. There were to be no loans under the provisions of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners Loans Measure, and no scheme for expenditure on new buildings could be undertaken by any college without consulting the Board of Supervision, until the end of the three-year period of the central fund arrangement.² Here was a call for centralisation and co-operation matched only by the demands made in the 1914-1918 period, but those had been made only of the men's colleges. Here was a call for the colleges to acknowledge their group identity. The Committee was clear that the alternative, which some of them would have preferred, was Concentration. The stark choice was placed before the colleges.

1 Church Assembly: Report of the Committee of Enquiry presented to the Board of Supervision, 6.12.1933, pp. 54, 57, 66.

2 Ibid., p. 68.

It is not difficult to see how the Committee came to make the recommendations which it did. It would have been aware of the opinion formed by Lord Grey in July and, while it was engaged in its work, its Chairman, the Bishop of Peterborough, led a deputation representing all the Voluntary colleges to the President of the Board of Education, to express alarm at the effect of the 8% reduction in admissions and to seek stabilisation of grants for a limited period, preferably on the basis of amounts paid in 1931-32 or, failing that, those paid in 1932-33. The President ruled this out on the ground of prohibitive cost, but suggested the raising of fees to £50 and hinted that while this was taking effect the Board of Education might make a special grant for one year on the lines of the 'relief grant' which had been proposed in the previous year.¹ The Committee's Report was criticised during the Assembly debate on it in 1934 as, 'that sort of submission which they in the Church of England were so fond of giving to the Government in power'.² It was criticism heightened by the fact that, as we shall see, the other Voluntary colleges chose not to follow the same path.

-
- 1 National Society: Annual Report, 1934, p. 16. Discussions on this payment had begun with the Treasury in July, the President admitting that with the further reductions he could not 'refuse to admit the equity of compensation'. The outcome hoped for at the Board is perhaps indicated by the description of the payment as a 'bribe needed as leverage towards a new pool necessary to secure the closing of colleges'. See ED 24/1936 Letter from E.G. Howarth to C.L. Stocks, 6.7.1933, and reply, 13.7.1933. Public Record Office.
 - 2 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XV, No. 1, 1934, p. 141.

After the publication of the Report the Board of Supervision sought the views of the Board of Education, because it was anxious to go to the Church Assembly with a statement that the Board supported the scheme and would aid it. Pelham, however, was unwilling to make a statement about the extent of help likely to be offered, until he knew the reaction of the Assembly, on the ground that 'once bitten, twice shy'.¹ College Governing Bodies were also consulted, and there is irony in the Board of Supervision's reference to the 'well-known loyalty of the Training Colleges to the general interests of the colleges as a group' which had overcome the serious reservations of many colleges about the proposals. It was, rather, a huddling together for individual safety.²

Those reservations were about the effect of raising fees, especially if the L.E.A. colleges did not follow suit, and about the administration of the Common Fund. Only eight colleges gave unqualified approval. Culham, Brighton, Derby, Fishponds, Ripon and Truro wanted direct representation in the administration of the Fund. Warrington, in its new, centrally funded buildings, not surprisingly perhaps insisted that administration should remain with the Board of Supervision. Bede made it clear that its approval of the proposals was not to be taken as expressing

1 ED 86/60 Church Training Colleges, Note of Conversation, Secretary with Board of Supervision, undated. Public Record Office.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 11.1.1934, p. 254.

approval of the Board's general policy. Saltley alone advanced the view that Concentration was the best policy for dealing with the situation.¹

That all colleges did not share the feelings of loyalty to the group spoken of in the Board of Supervision, was evident in the Church Assembly debate on the Report in 1934. In that debate, Canon Partridge pulled no punches, pointing out that the Assembly had lost all the advantages which the Board of Education had been prepared to give on the temporary closure suggested in the previous year, and that therefore the choice was now between a pool and permanent closure.² There was little doubt that the former would be chosen in spite of all reservations, but an alternative strategy was put forward by the Bishop of Chichester, requesting the Board of Supervision to look at the circumstances of each college as presented by its Governing Body and to decide on a policy appropriate to the need of each particular college.³

He did not receive sufficient support to carry the day, but the Bishop's view that each college held its destiny in its own hands found a ready response from the representatives of Exeter, one of whom thought that the establishment of a pool would mean the loss of individual character.⁴ The Principal of Exeter, who

1 C.A.F. 100 Church Assembly. Central Board of Finance: First Interim Report for 1934. Church Training Colleges for Teachers. Summary of Replies to Questions put to Governing Bodies.

2 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XV, No. 1, 1934, p. 122.

3 Ibid., p. 125.

4 Ibid., p. 132.

had declined to be interviewed by the Committee, had indicated before the publication of the Report that he would oppose its proposals 'in every possible way', seeing them as compelling efficient colleges to pay for those who had followed the advice of the Board of Supervision and embarked on schemes of improvement, 'without knowing where the money was to come from to pay for them'.¹ Both Chichester, with £10,000 available in the diocese, and Exeter, with £20,000 in a diocesan fund for the college, were in a strong financial position. Canon Partridge had stressed that what was being asked for was not centralisation but 'a system of Christian co-operation',² but the debate showed so little enthusiasm for that co-operation that a representative of Lincoln was moved to comment that 'so much of what had been said made him feel perfectly miserable about the spirit of the Church'.³ Not a few of the representatives must have regretted that the temporary closure policy had not been adopted, and it was a reluctant Assembly which approved the Report and its proposals.

The way was then open for the Board of Education to make known its attitude, and for Governing Bodies to be formally approached and asked to state their intentions with regard to a

-
- 1 Board of Supervision, General Correspondence: letter from A.L. Collins, 25.11.1933.
 - 2 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XV, No. 1, 1934, p. 123.
 - 3 Ibid., p. 146.

pooling in a Common Fund. The Board introduced a new article into the Regulations for the Training of Teachers, enabling it to deduct from the grant to a college and pay direct to the central body of a group, 'such agreed sums as would, under the scheme, be paid by the college'. At the same time it was agreed that for the year 1934-35 the Board would make a special non-recurring grant to the non-provided colleges, of £20 for each student lost.¹

The response from the colleges showed that Chichester and Ripon, Exeter and Saltley did not wish to join the scheme, though Mr. Holland was confident that Saltley would come round 'on being reasoned with'.² The remaining twenty-two English colleges agreed to participate, though many still had reservations. The Chairman of St. Hild's Committee spoke for more than his own college in saying that 'the reluctance ... in accepting the proposed increase of fee has not been diminished'.³ The General Council was called to advise on the administration of the pool, but the Council of Chichester wanted the meeting to do more than that, and a rearguard action to drum up support for a reconsideration of the whole scheme, describing the Common Fund and the alternative of Concentration as 'possibly panic measures, not justified by the actual state of

1 Education in 1934: Report of the Board of Education, pp. 59ff.

2 ED 86/60 Letter from Holland to A.P. Oppé, 23.3.1934. Public Record Office.

3 Letter from R. Burdon to Board of Supervision, 8.3.1934. College of St. Hild and St. Bede Archives.

college finances'¹, emerged. The outcome of the meeting, in April 1934, was that a deputation of the General Council was appointed to discuss the scheme with the Board of Supervision, but there was no fundamental reconsideration, and the General Council approved the administrative proposals which had been put forward by the Board.

The Common Fund was to be constituted in July 1934, under the management of the Board of Supervision, with the money held by the Central Board of Finance who would report annually to the Assembly and to the colleges. Late application to enter the scheme was permitted, and all colleges were to have direct access to the Board. Claims would be entertained to meet the expected deficits on the income and expenditure accounts, but new capital expenditure was excluded.²

The General Council did, however, ask the Board of Supervision to impress on the Board of Education that the colleges would consider themselves free to reduce fees at the end of the three year period. It was also instrumental in bringing pressure to bear on the Board of Supervision to recognise the peculiar position of students in the distressed areas of Durham, Northumberland, Yorkshire and Lancashire. It was agreed that the fees to students from those areas at college in those areas

1 Letter from Principal of Chichester, 18.3.1934. College of St. Hild and St. Bede Archives.

2 General Council of the Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 26.4.1934.

would be £45 rather than £50, though colleges would have to pay into the pool as if the fee received were £50.¹ St. Hild's had asked for a concession in its own case because it was considered that the raising of fees, from £35 for diocesan students and £40 for other students to £40 and £45 respectively, would have provided adequately for the college's needs.²

It was hoped that this reduction would persuade Ripon to withdraw its opposition to the scheme, but the college, fearing competition from surrounding non-Church institutions, stood by its original decision to raise fees only if there were a common policy agreed by both provided and non-provided colleges. The attempt to secure that common policy, at a conference in December 1933, had failed.³

In the event Ripon and Exeter were the only two colleges which did not participate. That loyalty of the colleges to each other which the Board of Supervision claimed had alone induced the other colleges to enter into a scheme involving 'sacrifices ... of a novel kind'⁴, a loyalty which was in fact rather thin, was to wear thinner during the three years in which the scheme ran its course, and in which dislike of the Board of Supervision

1 General Council: Minutes, 1.6.1934.

2 A. Harrison, Treasurer. Note on the Application of the Board of Supervision scheme to St. Hild's College of St. Hild and St. Bede Archives.

3 Board of Supervision, General Correspondence: letter to Bishop of Peterborough, 5.12.1933, and see below Section IV.

4 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 3, 14.6.1934, p. 3.

intensified. It was, however, one of the risks the Board had seen might be incurred in the proposals for keeping all the colleges in being.¹ The colleges survived by submitting themselves, kicking and struggling, to a firm regimen.

1 C.A.F. 100 Church Assembly. Central Board of Finance: First Interim Report for 1934. Church Training Colleges for Teachers.

CHAPTER 4

CONCENTRATION AFTER ALL

The mechanics of the Common Fund made it almost inevitable that disagreements would arise. The efficient working of the scheme depended on colleges exercising the utmost economy, and it was a condition of grant that accounts should be set out in a form approved by professional auditors, to make comparison possible, and that the Board of Supervision should be satisfied about the reason for excess of expenditure per student over the average expenditure in the colleges generally. But colleges disliked receiving queries from the Board on what was considered to be abnormal or unexplained expenditure.¹ There was dispute, too, with some colleges about the amounts payable into the pool. It was found necessary in February 1935 to set up a sub-committee of the Board of Supervision to deal with disagreements which had arisen with Chester and Saltley.²

There is no record of a meeting of the Council of Principals in this period, but the measure of their dissatisfaction is seen in the points raised by them in a Memorandum circulated on their behalf by the Principal of Saltley and presented to the General Council in May 1936 at a meeting called at the request of the Principals. They wanted a detailed account of the grounds on

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 3, 6.2.1936, p. 40.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 3, 7.2.1935, p. 18.

which the amount payable to individual colleges was determined, and expressed their disquiet that though the scheme laid down that grants could not be made for new capital expenditure it was understood that there were cases where such expenditure had been allowed to rank for grant. The Board had not exercised its veto in cases where what had been proposed was considered to be substitution for outworn or dilapidated parts of the existing buildings.¹ Questions posed by the Bishops of St. Albans and Chichester in the Church Assembly, about the working of the Common Fund, betray an over-anxiety that justice should be seen to be done and all colleges treated fairly.² The suspicion of the Board of Supervision's stewardship is, however, indicative of the poor spirit in which this co-operative venture was for the most part undertaken.

The purpose of the scheme was to keep all colleges in being until July 1937, in the hope of an increase in the number of students recognised for grant, though provision had been made to continue the arrangement if the General Council gave its consent. By July 1936, however, the Principals, in the Memorandum referred to above, were pressing for an early decision on reduction of fees for 1937. A warning note had been sounded by the Bishop of Peterborough in February about a decline in the number of applicants

1 Memorandum, General Council of Church Training Colleges, 25.5.1936. College of St. Hild and St. Bede Archives.

2 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XVII, No. 1, 1936, pp. 16-17.

for entry, and anxiety on this was to continue.¹ Such a decline, and consequent further loss of income, would threaten the whole scheme. It was this possibility which was brought to the attention of the General Council by the Board of Supervision, as suggesting the need to abandon the Common Fund.²

The General Council at its December 1936 meeting resolved that the Fund should be wound up at the end of the three-year period and its assets distributed. Many colleges 'did not feel justified in delaying their schemes of improvement by diverting their income for the benefit of other colleges'.³ We have to see this as a major factor in the decision, and indeed it had become apparent in the first year of the pool that colleges which had had to delay their enlargement and improvement were at a disadvantage, for colleges where schemes had been completed and interest on loans was permitted expenditure secured a correspondingly larger claim on the Common Fund.⁴ Another factor, however, was the frustration of colleges, including Lincoln and Derby, which felt that they had been prevented from making improvements which they were able to finance without recourse to

-
- 1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 3, 6.2.1936, p. 43.
 - 2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 3, 2.12.1936, p. 95.
 - 3 C.A. 590 Memorandum by Board of Supervision on Concentration, October 1937.
 - 4 Board of Supervision: Memorandum on the First Year's Working of the Common Fund, 22.5.1936, p. 6. College of St. Hild and St. Bede Archives.

the Common Fund¹, and there was a general awareness that nearly all the colleges would require additional places, which could only come from closures, in order to make their financial position secure. By 1936 it was clear that the wish of individual colleges coincided with the view of the Board of Supervision, which it had consistently held, that there was little point in keeping twenty-eight colleges in being unless they were in a position to withstand competition.²

During the lifetime of the Fund a total of forty-three grants had been made to seventeen colleges. The fact that there was a balance of almost £24,000 out of a total income of £48,436 suggests that there was either excessive economy in the administration of the Fund, or a reluctance to make full use of the resources to help the weaker colleges, for fear perhaps of the reaction of other colleges. The former interpretation is supported by the Principal of Whitelands' complaint in 1937 that, in spite of having been in receipt of grants from the Common Fund, the college was still in debt and the economies effected in recent years had been so drastic as to endanger the educational value of the college.³

The large balance also suggests that one of the colleges' original objections to the pool, that the total sum asked for was

-
- 1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 22.3.1934, p. 266.
 - 2 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XVIII, No. 3, 1937, p. 510.
 - 3 National Society, Whitelands Correspondence: letter from Miss Counsell, 18.10.1937.

greatly in excess of the amount needed, was not without substance.¹ The assumption of deficits larger than they actually were may be excused, however, for it is clear that the Committee of Enquiry did not receive from the colleges all the financial information necessary.² In the event the large balance enabled colleges which had received grants to receive the balance of what they had put in, while colleges which had not received grants received 80% of what they had contributed.³

The ending of the Common Fund left no alternative to Concentration. The meeting of the General Council in December 1936 which recommended the former also requested the Board of Supervision to consider whether the latter was necessary, and if so to put forward a reasoned scheme.⁴ It was thus possible when the matter was presented to the Church Assembly in 1937 for the Bishop of Peterborough to claim, with the previous abortive attempt in mind,

-
- 1 A.L. Lawrence, Principal of St. Hild's: Report on Three Year Plan, 15.5.1936, p. 1. College of St. Hild and St. Bede Archives.
 - 2 The Principal of St. Hild's admitted that 'if their estimate of our position bears little relation to the facts, we are partly to blame', (letter from A.L. Lawrence to A. Harrison, Treasurer, 20.3.1934. College of St. Hild and St. Bede Archives) and the Principal of Chichester, questioning the assumed deficits, urged all colleges to attend the General Council in April 1934 'with a clear idea of their own Finances'. (Letter to Principals, 18.3.1934. College of St. Hild and St. Bede Archives).
 - 3 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 3, 6.12.1937, p. 78. Correspondence with Board of Education, letter dated 20.12.1937.
 - 4 General Council of the Church Training Colleges: Minutes, Book 3, 2.12.1936.

that 'the impulse towards Concentration had come not from the Board of Supervision but from the colleges themselves'.¹ That was true, however, only insofar as the colleges had indicated their unwillingness to continue with the Common Fund, and as soon as that unwillingness became known the Board of Supervision had turned its mind to the alternative.

As early as October 1936 the Board saw the opportunity presented by an offer to purchase the college at Brighton, which occupied a poor site. Concentration at Chichester, it was suggested, would clear the financial position of both colleges and augment numbers at others.² In November, before being instructed by the General Council to prepare a scheme, the Board had set up a sub-committee of three, including Mr. Mayor and Sir Edmund Phipps, to consider the question of Concentration in general and in particular and to consult with the Board of Education. Moreover it approved the sale of Brighton, whether it were to involve transfer, amalgamation or closure of the existing college, and although the Board encouraged the college to think it would support transfer to a new site it was never considered a likely proposition.³

The meeting of the Board in February 1937, which received the request of the General Council that it should consider whether

1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XVIII, No. 3, 1937, p. 509.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 3, 6.10.1936, p. 77.

3 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 3, 17.11.1936, p. 91.

Concentration was necessary, also received a letter from the recently retired Mr. Holland¹ setting out such a scheme. He proposed the closure of two men's colleges, Culham and Chester, together with Brighton, Bishop's Stortford and Truro.

The sub-committee appointed in November put forward six possible schemes. On the basis of the number of additional places asked for by the colleges, 478, four different schemes were suggested, which would have involved the closure of four or five colleges. On the basis however of the additional numbers which the sub-committee estimated were required, 366, the closure of Culham and Brighton, and either Salisbury or Truro was suggested.²

In May 1937 the Archbishop of Canterbury, no doubt to strengthen the hand of the Board of Supervision, appointed Lord Eustace Percy to advise the Board on Concentration.³ Lord Percy suggested that, as it was impossible to forecast whether the Board of Education would eventually restore the places lost in successive cuts up to 1934, the Concentration plan adopted should

-
- 1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 3, 4.2.1937, p. 120. Mr. Holland retired in November 1936 and was succeeded as Secretary of the National Society and the Board of Supervision by Mr. E.R. Hussey.
 - 2 Board of Supervision, National Emergency and Concentration of Colleges Correspondence: Statement of sub-committee appointed 5.11.1936.
 - 3 Lord Eustace Percy was assistant to Edward Wood, and succeeded him as President of the Board of Education in 1924, serving until 1929. His appointment by the Archbishop illustrates the level of expertise and experience the Church of England was able to draw upon from within the educational and political establishment.

be such as to give surviving colleges numbers ranging from 150 to 200, to enable them to be adequately maintained.¹ Culham was in a weaker position than any of the men's colleges, on account of its small size and the nature of its buildings. Brighton could be disposed of because that would still leave Chichester in the diocese, with a better site and buildings. Truro was thought unlikely to be able to finance a scheme to bring it up to an economic size, and Bishop's Stortford, though its site and premises were better than others, was thought to be geographically the least well placed.²

The plan presented to the General Council in July was that suggested by Mr. Holland, with the exclusion of Chester. It was recommended, subject to a reconsideration by the Board of the comparative claims of Bishop's Stortford and Peterborough, and of Truro and Fishponds.³ After meeting Governing Body representatives of all the colleges named, the Board accepted one of the suggested changes and substituted Peterborough for Bishop's Stortford. The latter made strong claims as a college in an area of rapidly increasing population, but Peterborough was short of students and had carried out no major scheme of reorganisation, a determining factor in the case of all three women's colleges to be closed. On other than financial grounds

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 3, 19.5.1937, p. 17.

2 C.A. 590 Memorandum by Board of Supervision on Concentration, October 1937.

3 General Council of Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 9.7.1937.

the claim of Truro was strong, not only as 'an outpost of the Church in a Methodist stronghold', but also as a valued conference centre for Adult Education in a county where the only other such provision was the Camborne School of Mines. The financial argument won the day. The case was forcibly argued that Culham was in a healthy financial position and had a growing reputation for training teachers for rural work. It was these positive advantages, as much as the college outcry at this second threat to its existence, which led to the deferment of the Culham question until the publication of the Archbishops' Commission on Training for the Ministry, in the hope that the college might be used for training ordinands in teaching.¹

The Church Assembly debate on the proposed closures in the autumn of 1937 was marked by the general feeling that the recommendations were unwelcome but necessary, though the view that Concentration should be the last step, taken only if compelled by the Board of Education, was represented. The violent opposition the Assembly had shown to the 1932 proposals was not, however, repeated, for as the Bishop of Chester,

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 3, 20.7.1937, pp. 33-58. Naylor describes the campaign mounted by the Culham Club which formed a Defence Committee and set up a Deputations Board to interview influential people in the Assembly and lobby members of the General Council. No one was left in doubt of the affection of the old students for their college. L. Naylor (1953) Culham 1853-1953, pp. 127-8.

victorious in that earlier debate, pointed out, the situation was different, with decisions having been arrived at with a greater degree of consultation. In fact, the Board of Supervision had acted very little differently. What was different was that, as Lord Grey himself pointed out, the Central Board of Finance, while supporting the plan, had had no part in putting the Concentration advice forward.¹ The hostility in 1932 to what had appeared to be the dominant role of the Central Board was not evident in 1937, although its attitude then was just as crucial.

There was however a widespread sympathy with Truro and for the local and diocesan effects of closure. It is impossible to read the published history of the college or the points made in the Assembly by the Truro representatives without being very aware of the deep sense of loss to the Church and county of Cornwall which the closure meant.² Its retention was supported by the County Education Committee and all the teachers' associations in Cornwall. An amendment to secure the retention of Truro was defeated by the narrow margin of 213 votes to 207. The total recorded attendance for the debate, 457, the largest recorded for any debate in 1937, indicates the measure of interest shown in the matter.³

-
- 1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XVIII, No. 3, 1937, p. 540.
 - 2 M.G. Brown (1938) Training in Truro, 1813-1938.
 - 3 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XVIII, No. 3, 1937, p. 546.

The Board of Education, which had been particularly cautious in view of the previous abortive attempt to secure Concentration, was officially notified that the three colleges would close in July 1938 and permission was sought for redistribution of their 327 places.¹ The women's colleges had requested 260 places to bring their total to 2,052 and the Board of Education raised no objection to the remaining places being allocated to the men's colleges, to bring their total to 1,227, on the curious ground that Peterborough had once been a men's college.² In spite of repeated requests from Culham for an improvement scheme to be considered, the college was not to know its fate until March 1938, when it was decided that it could no longer be left in suspense, even though the report on training for the ministry had not been published. Culham was informed that the proposal for closure would lapse in the event of the college making proposals satisfactory from the educational and financial point of view, after examination of the accounts by the Central Board.³ It was thus made clear that there were hurdles still to jump and that the college was not yet entirely free from threat.

It was asserted by a speaker in the 1937 Church Assembly debate that if the Assembly had never been formed not one single

-
- 1 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letter dated 19.1.1938.
 - 2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 4, 4.1.1938, p. 88.
 - 3 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 4, 17.3.1938, p. 68.

college in England would ever have been lost, for every diocese involved would have come to the aid of its college.¹ But centralisation had taken place because it was realised that the colleges could not survive as isolated units, and 1937 was not the time to go back on that and put local loyalty to the test. The Board of Supervision acted to secure an effective continuing Church presence in the field of teacher-training. The particular choice made of colleges to be closed is, however, to be regretted. No doubt each individual college could have made out a good case for survival, but there were features about the Brighton situation and the importance of Truro which went unrecognised.

At Brighton there had been the possibility of a joint venture with the local authority in the provision of a college in which the Church would have had forty of the one hundred and fifty places. The Board of Supervision, however, insisted on the distribution of all Brighton's 132 places to other Church colleges, and the opportunity of an interesting experiment was missed.² At Truro, relations with the Nonconformists in a predominantly Nonconformist county, which had been strained earlier in the century, had by 1928 undergone a radical change. The Committee of Enquiry had found that 'the influence of the college with the L.E.A. seemed to be greater than in any other part of the country'. The authority was in fact willing to make a grant to the college if it could

1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XVIII, No. 3, 1937, p. 529.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 4, 14.6.1937, p. 22.

nominate two members to its Council. The Principal was a member of the Education Committee and of practically every sub-committee, and the link between the Church and the education authority, through the college, was considered in the area to be of great value.¹ In addition, there was a Methodist chaplain working alongside his Anglican counterpart. 'In that way the Principal had tackled a delicate problem with conspicuous success'.²

Financial determinants were uppermost, however, and what could have been seen as pioneering developments which might have been encouraged were stifled. The essential consideration was that the twenty-five remaining colleges, with their increased numbers, should re-establish their financial position so that the promulgation of schemes of necessary capital expenditure for improvement, suspended in 1931, could be resumed without further delay.

-
- 1 Committee of Enquiry 1933, Minutes and Reports of Interviews: Report on Truro, attached to p. 161.
 - 2 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XVIII, No. 3, 1937, p. 515.

SECTION III

ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES

CHAPTER 1

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISION

There were two significant administrative changes in this period in relation to the Church of England colleges. These were the reconstruction of the Board of Supervision and the appointment of a Moderator. The two are not unconnected, for they were both attempts to bring the colleges into closer relationship with the central body and lessen the suspicion which clung about the Board of Supervision.

Lord Grey claimed in the Church Assembly in 1936 that one valuable result of the Common Fund was the bringing of the colleges and the Board of Supervision into closer liaison with each other, 'so that there should be more real and intimate discussion and more appreciation of each other's aims'.¹ It is unlikely that that appreciation grew as a result of the working of the Fund, for it was pointed out at the meeting of the General Council in May 1936 that the representatives of both the colleges and the Board of Supervision must have been conscious at its meetings that there was a regrettable lack of confidence between the two groups. The concern was enough for the Chairman to put the matter to the Archbishops, who approved that steps should be taken to bring about

1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XVII, No. 2, 1936, p. 261.

a closer liaison, and that college opinions should be sought as to how this could be effected.¹

The Principals' Memorandum presented at that meeting stressed the need of a clearer understanding on the part of the colleges of their relations with the Board. It was an executive body which was not effectively responsible to the colleges, which tended therefore to resent the exercise of its influence. The administration of the Common Fund was but one cause of resentment. A further cause was the continuing intervention in the appointment and payment of Principals, always a matter of concern to the Board. Culham in 1929 wished to appoint a Principal at a salary of at least £800. The Board of Education approved the sum of £850 but the Board of Supervision would support no more than £700.² There was a similar intervention in 1930, leading to the payment of a lower salary than Warrington had proposed for its Principal.³ The line, however, could not be held, and the Board of Education indicated in 1933, in connection with Winchester, that larger salaries than those paid were necessary in order to secure a satisfactory field of candidates for college posts.⁴ St. Hild's was in bad odour with the Board in 1933 for ignoring the established

-
- 1 General Council of Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 29.5.1936. Members of the Board of Supervision who were not representatives of individual colleges were invited to attend meetings of the General Council from 1926.
 - 2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 5.6.1929, p. 99.
 - 3 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 25.7.1930, p. 128.
 - 4 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 2.11.1933, p. 244.

procedure of submitting the short-list of candidates for the post of Principal for comment by the Board. The appointment of Miss A.L. Lawrence, who began her letter of application with the admission that such an application 'from one who has no direct experience of teaching, must savour of impertinence', did not retrieve the immediate situation and caused the Board, on educational grounds, some anxiety.¹

The Board itself was anxious for closer liaison with the colleges and removal of suspicion of its activities. Its informal approaches to them revealed that what rankled was that which had rankled since the Board had come into being, and the suggestions for closer relations hinged on there being a considerably increased membership to give all colleges a sense of direct involvement.² The general feeling was that there was lack of any real contact between the Board and the colleges as a body, for the electoral constituencies were so wide that representatives found it difficult to keep in effective touch with all the colleges they represented. The General Council did not provide this opportunity for contact, for it met only when summoned by the Board, often after the Board had already consulted colleges individually and separately, and then only, it was felt, to act in an advisory capacity. The demand for

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 2, 4.5.1933, p. 236 and letter from A.L. Lawrence, 17.11.1932. College of St. Hild and St. Bede Archives.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 3, 6.10.1936, p. 81.

constitutional change was clear, and the Board acknowledged this demand in the setting up of a sub-committee to consider the matter at the end of 1936.

The sub-committee was ready with its recommendations in January 1937. It proposed an increase from 17 to 24 members, to include fourteen members appointed by the colleges, an increase of five, and eight nominated members, six by the National Society and two by the Central Board. For the purpose of representation, colleges were to be grouped on a geographical basis, with seven groups each represented by two members. The Board, in a new departure, was to report annually to the Church Assembly.¹

By the time the revised constitution was presented to the General Council in July, the proposed National Society nominations had been reduced to two, and replaced by two representatives of the Assembly and two nominees of the Archbishops. The preoccupation of the colleges with Concentration at this time led, however, to a postponement of the settlement of the constitutional question.²

It was not until March 1938 that the General Council, exercising an unusually authoritative role, approved the constitution, with a minor amendment reducing the number of college representatives to thirteen to give only one representative from the Welsh group of two colleges.³ The chairmanship remained in the gift of the

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 3, 8.1.1937, pp. 106-107.

2 General Council of Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 9.7.1937.

3 General Council of Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 30.3.1938.

Archbishops, and the reconstituted Board met for the first time in November 1938. It was a reconstitution which would have brought little joy to those who wanted more direct representation, or those who, like the Principal of St. Hild's, wished the Board to be an executive body responsible to a General Council which had legislative as opposed to merely advisory functions.¹ The resolutions of the Council of Principals, that two places on the Board should be reserved for persons of educational standing and experience and that there should be a minimum number of women, were ignored², but there was a certain satisfaction that colleges had been consulted and their fears, anxieties and resentments taken note of.

The appointment of a Moderator, however, met with a much more positive approval. He was in fact the direct successor of the Archbishops' Inspector, the last of whom had retired in 1918, and his appointment represented the end of a search for a body at the centre to whom the colleges felt able easily to relate.

The Archbishops' Inspector had always been an independent officer, responsible to the Archbishops alone, and there was no immediate move by them in 1918 to find a replacement. After the triennial elections to the Board of Supervision in 1921 the new Board turned its attention to the matter, and a sub-committee recommended to the Archbishops and the National Society, which had paid the Inspector's salary, the appointment of a replacement

1 A.L. Lawrence: Report on the Three Year Plan, 15.5.1936, pp. 6-7, College of St. Hild and St. Bede Archives.

2 Council of Principals: Minutes, 10.3.1938, 30.3.1938.

with authority to continue the inspection of arrangements for Religious Knowledge and the exercise of a general oversight of the work of the colleges.¹ The difficulties facing the colleges at the time no doubt prevented any action being taken, and when the matter was discussed by the Council of Principals in 1924 they expressed the hope that the post would not be revived in its old form. It is clear that what they wanted was not an inquisitorial figure, though they agreed that he should provide the Archbishops with first-hand knowledge of the religious activity in the colleges, but an officer who could act on behalf of the colleges in liaising with the Central Board of Finance and the Board of Supervision.

Perhaps the idea of a different kind of Inspector was too new, for the recommendation was accepted that the suggestion should go to the Archbishops but no further.² There the matter apparently rested until Mr. Holland told the Council of Principals in May 1927 that the National Society was willing to find the salary of the Archbishops' Inspector and that an appointment would soon be made. It was not to be, however, and it is not difficult to understand how other matters at the time crowded out consideration of this. The National Society returned to the subject in 1932, urged that the post should be filled, and informed the Board of Supervision that it viewed the situation with regard to religious instruction in colleges with grave anxiety.³

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 1, 9.2.1922, p. 114.

2 Council of Principals: Minutes, 9.1.1924.

3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 14, 4.5.1932, p. 410.

In the summer session of the Church Assembly in 1933 the Archbishop of Canterbury announced that he was taking steps to revive the office of Archbishops' Inspector, after a forceful speech by the Bishop of Bradford expressing his concern with what he observed to be the lack of Church teaching in the definite sense, and his suspicions that 'the pass was being sold by the Principals'.¹ The absence of inspection was noted by the Committee of Enquiry, and was perhaps an additional reason for giving religious instruction such prominence in its Report. The Committee attached so much importance to its suggestion, that there should be a number of Inspectors rather than entrusting the task to one single individual, that the Chairman was asked to convey it in advance of the Report, to the Archbishop of Canterbury.²

The Archbishop agreed to consider it, and when publicity was given to it in the Assembly in 1934 he interjected the remark that he had already given his consent. The Bishop of Bradford, characterising the Committee's findings on the religious atmosphere in the colleges as having 'smacked of soothing syrup for the suspicious', moved that the Board of Supervision should provide for inspection, and the Assembly gave its approval.³ The Board

-
- 1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XIV, No. 2, 1933, pp. 272, 275.
 - 2 Inspection of Church Training Colleges: Memorandum by Bishop of Peterborough, undated. College of St. Hild and St. Bede Archives.
 - 3 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XV, No. 1, 1934, pp. 151, 149.

was slow to take action, and the matter was next discussed by the General Council in October, when the colleges made it abundantly clear that they wanted the Inspectors to be concerned only with the religious life of the colleges. A resolution expressing the undesirability of combining religious inspection with inspection of buildings and finance was accepted from Fishponds, together with St. Gabriel's resolution that the primary function of Inspectors 'shall be to advise and help' those responsible for the religious life and teaching of the college.¹

It was not until the end of 1935 that a scheme was inaugurated, involving the appointment of a panel of Visitors, 'well-equipped in education technique' or qualified to look at the religious aspect of the work.² Each college was then visited by two members of the panel and a general report on the visits was drawn up. The Visitors to St. Hild's College confined themselves strictly to comment on the religious tone and teaching of the college³, but the brief general report went further and contained suggestions of a constructive nature, not only about the religious instruction and worship but also about better provision for study and for leisure.⁴ There is no indication that the Visitors were not well

1 General Council of Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 4.10.1934.

2 National Society: Annual Report, 1937, p. 20.

3 Report of Visit, 17-19.2.1936, Bishop of Pontefract, Miss Ady, Fellow of St. Hugh's College, Oxford. College of St. Hild and St. Bede Archives.

4 Board of Supervision, Reports on Training College Visitations 1935-37: Report on Visitations of Church Training Colleges.

received, and the Council of Principals in 1938, meeting for the first time in seven years, expressed their appreciation of the report, though it was not discussed in detail.¹

There was however a reaction from two colleges. Warrington took exception to the Visitors' view that the Anglo-Catholic character of the chapel services 'must prevent some from applying',² and the refusal of Carmarthen to receive a visit from the Board of Supervision in 1937 was perhaps the response to the carefully worded letter sent after the visitation, suggesting that the restrictions imposed on the lives of the students by the college authorities were hostile to the development of personality.³ The Visitors had found that study-bedrooms were not used for study, which was still done under supervision, and the nature of other restrictions may be deduced from the Principal's report for 1935-36, which contains a diatribe, taking up half the report, against the popular press, the B.B.C. and the cinema, as forces working in opposition to those concerned with education.⁴

The Visitors to Winchester drew attention to a situation where a number of staff who had been there for many years had become obstacles to progress. Their report, confirmed by a Board

1 Council of Principals: Minutes, 10.3.1938.

2 Board of Supervision, Reports on Training College Visitations 1935-37: Abstract.

3 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 4, 16.3.1937, p. 37.

4 National Society, Carmarthen Correspondence: Principal's report 1935-36.

of Education Inspection in 1935, led to the retirement of the Vice-Principal and one other member of staff.¹

The continued provision for inspection was the subject of a letter from the Archdeacon of Northumberland considered by the Board of Supervision in February 1938. He suggested that there should be not another round of visits on the previous pattern, but the appointment of a peripatetic consultant and adviser, and, in addition, the release of the Secretary, Mr. Hussey², from clerical work to devote his time to working out policy, to visiting colleges and to strengthening liaison. The Board resolved to ask the Archbishops to appoint, on the nomination of the Board, 'some person who would have special duties to perform in connection with the Church Training Colleges'.³

The Archdeacon himself had suggested Canon Cockin, recently appointed to St. Paul's Cathedral, who had been invited to become the Revising Examiner for the Archbishops' Certificate examination in 1938, with responsibility for approving syllabuses sent in by colleges. In forwarding the resolution, the Board of Supervision was aware from discussions it had had with representatives of the Principals that they had been thinking along the lines of the

1 M. Rose (1981) A History of King Alfred's College, Winchester, 1840-1980, p. 84.

2 Hussey's career perhaps fitted him ill for his post. He joined the Sudan Civil Service in 1908, had been Director of Education for Uganda and came to the Society after seven years as Director of Education for Nigeria. Who Was Who (1961) Vol. V.

3 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 4, 3.2.1938, p. 103.

appointment of such an adviser, but chiefly in connection with a new machinery for the Archbishops' Certificate examination, designed to permit greater flexibility and to enhance the Certificate in the eyes of the students.¹

The Council of Principals formulated its proposal in March, and suggested that on the lines of the Joint Board system there should be Regional Boards of Studies for the examination, each of which would appoint its own external examiner and be responsible for syllabuses and for deciding on the methods of examination. A Moderator would be required to ensure the standardisation of results between the Regional Boards, and it was indicated that the appointment of Canon Cockin would be acceptable to all the colleges.² The scheme was unanimously recommended to the Board of Supervision by the General Council, the approval of the Archbishops to Canon Cockin's appointment was sought and the Central Board was approached to pay his part-time salary.³

Canon Cockin's role was defined as 'adviser to the Church Training Colleges and the Board of Supervision in matters relating to the religious life, religious education and worship of the colleges', and as 'Moderator in the Archbishops' Examination'.⁴

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 4, 8.12.1937, p. 82. The Principals were far from unanimous that the examination should continue.

2 Council of Principals: Minutes, 10.3.1938.

3 General Council of Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 30.3.1938.

4 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 5, 7.7.1938, p. 44.

He was well fitted for the task, having been Assistant Secretary of the Student Christian Movement for twelve years, and Vicar of the University Church in Oxford for five years before going to St. Paul's. In making an informal approach to him in February 1938 the Bishop of Peterborough had described the task as one of 'making himself a friend to Principals and Lecturers and students'.¹

The style and manner in which he fulfilled his responsibilities was to give him a relationship with the colleges quite different from that experienced by the Archbishops' Inspectors of old. The style is seen from the first, in his request to Hussey that the letter informing the Principals of his appointment should have an informal tone, with an emphasis on his being at the disposal of the colleges for consultation and to help them to get to know about one another.² Just how little group awareness there was at that time may be seen from the decision of Warrington College in 1938, after eight years in Liverpool, to change its name to St. Katharine's, taking no account of the fact that the Church already had a college so named. The authorities of St. Katharine's Tottenham understandably protested about the lack of consultation, but by then it was too late.³ The Board of Supervision had been informed of the change, but not consulted.

1 Board of Supervision, Secretary's Correspondence: letter dated 4.2.1938.

2 Ibid., letter dated 30.7.1938.

3 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 5, 2.2.1939, p. 84.

Bradbury describes Canon Cockin's appointment as ushering in 'not merely a new era but a new spirit'.¹ He set himself to build, and in some cases restore, the confidence of the colleges in the central administration after the vicissitudes of a decade.

1 J.L. Bradbury (1975) Chester College, 1839-1975, p. 211.

CHAPTER 2

THE NATIONAL SOCIETY AS THE CENTRAL COUNCIL FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Throughout the decade the National Society continued to pay the cost of the Archbishops' Certificate examinations and its contribution, begun in 1923, to the support of the Welsh colleges, unable in a disestablished Church to benefit from Assembly funds. It leased the new buildings of Whitelands, formally opened by the Queen in July 1931, made modest grants to the college to help cover losses in the years 1930-35, and to St. Mark and St. John, Chelsea, in 1934 and 1935, and contributed £2,120 towards the cost of study-bedrooms for the latter in 1937.¹ The National Society as a body did not play a decisive part in the crises affecting the colleges in the 1930s, although of course its Secretary, as Secretary also of the Board of Supervision, was very much concerned with the decision-making. The Society was preoccupied in the years after 1929 with an enlargement of its own role, which could have given it a new relationship to all the colleges and constituted a highly significant administrative change, had it been permitted to exercise that role to its full potential.

The Bishop of Gloucester in the Church Assembly debate in 1933 on the controversial move to close three colleges, regretted that the Church did not have a central educational authority able to speak for it as a whole and with regard to all parts of

1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 15, 22.4.1937, p. 210.

the education system.¹ He had been responsible for the important proposal that such a body should be set up, contained in the Report of the Commission on Religious Education presented to the Assembly in 1929.² The Report itself indicated that the reform of the National Society was an essential element in its proposal, and envisaged that the reconstituted Society, as the central body, would receive from the Assembly both the authority and the means to bring its decisions into practical effect in dealing with the whole field of religious education. It cannot be said that the proposal for a central administrative authority was received with enthusiasm by the Assembly in 1930, and an amendment opposed to further centralisation of power, and seeking to appoint only an advisory body, was lost by only two votes.³

Neither was there unanimity in the Assembly that it was the National Society which should become the central body, and slow progress was made by the Assembly committee appointed to prepare a scheme, in consultation with the Society, for the promotion of a Central Council, because it was unable to agree about the interpretation of its terms of reference. It was, as one member described it, 'a hobbled committee', because the Chairman, the Bishop of Liverpool, would not allow consideration of schemes

-
- 1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XIV, No. 1, 1933, p. 146.
 - 2 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. X, No. 3, 1929, p. 502.
 - 3 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XI, No. 3, 1930, pp. 520ff.

other than the reorganisation of the National Society, and the attempt to have the report of the committee referred back for consideration of alternative schemes came to nothing. The Assembly was perhaps swayed by the Bishop of Liverpool's statement that 'not a word in the (Commission's) Report pledged the Assembly to any new expenditure', and it was agreed in 1932 that, when a supplementary Charter had been secured, the Assembly would recognise the Governing Body of the Society as the Central Council of the Church for Religious Education.¹

The agreement, however, fell short of what the Commission had intended, for the Assembly did not fully endorse the recommendations it had made. Those recommendations had included the dropping of the title National Society, and direct representation of 43 Diocesan Education Councils or Boards on a new Standing Committee of 78 members.² This failure fully to implement the Commission's recommendations, together with the lack of financial provision for the new work the Society was asked to undertake, and the warning to the Society not to undertake any appeal to dioceses which might divert funds from the Central Board of Finance, sowed the seeds of its failure to fulfil those responsibilities.

The Society had expressed general approval of the proposal for its reconstruction contained in the Report of the Commission on Religious Education, for the idea of the Society as the central educational body had been before it for some years. When its new

1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XIII, No. 3, 1932, pp. 453ff.

2 Church Assembly: Minutes of Proceedings, Autumn 1929, Report of the Commission on Religious Education, C.A. 301, p. 174.

offices were built in Great Peter Street in Westminster in 1905, they had been deliberately planned to provide in advance all the necessary accommodation. The idea had been elaborated in the 1920 Memorandum drawn up by Mr. Holland in the hope of dissuading the newly-established Church Assembly from the setting up of an Education Committee, and that Memorandum had been part of the National Society's submission to the Commission on Religious Education.¹ But there was strong opposition to the proposed extension of the Society's responsibilities, for which a supplementary Charter was required, both within the Standing Committee and from the Subscribers' Defence Committee which came into being. The major fears were that the scheme would cripple the Society in the one field of work, Church Elementary schools, which it had made peculiarly its own, and that the autonomy of the Society would be lost in undue subordination to the Assembly.²

The Standing Committee decided to consult the subscribers before it expressed a final view, and the scheme presented to them in 1932 sought to allay their fears. The supplementary Charter, it was pointed out in a letter signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, would emphasise the continuity of the Society, which would remain self-governing, and the work for which it was founded, while enabling it to undertake some important new work.

-
- 1 National Society: Annual Report, 1932, p. 12. See also p. 237 above.
 - 2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 14, 3.3.1932, and National Society Correspondence: letter from Secretary, Subscribers' Defence Committee, 24.3.1932.

The funds of the Society earmarked for the work previously undertaken would continue to be so earmarked. Further, the rights of the subscribers would be safeguarded even more strongly in the new Standing Committee. In the old Committee there were 16 subscribers out of a total of 76 members, and their election was controlled by the Vice-Presidents, i.e. the Bishops and ten Peers or Privy Councillors, and subscribers present at the Annual Meeting. The new Standing Committee was to have 28 subscribers, elected by postal ballot by all members, out of a total Committee of 60, and there were to be 25 representatives of the Church Assembly.¹

From a total National Society membership of 3,824 there were 1,688 replies from subscribers in favour of the scheme and 282 against, with 14 qualified replies.² The Church Assembly gave its approval in 1933 for the Society to proceed, though even at that late stage there was an unsuccessful amendment designed to place the new central body under the effective control of the Assembly.³ The Society received its supplementary Royal Charter in March 1934, extending its function from 'the education of the poor' to 'the promotion, encouragement and support of Religious Education in accordance with the principles of the Church of England among all our subjects living in England and Wales'.⁴

1 National Society, Training Colleges Correspondence: letter dated 15.6.1932.

2 Ibid., letter dated 13.7.1932.

3 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XIV, No. 3, 1933, p. 499.

4 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 15, 6.6.1938, p. 382.

It was to be expected therefore that the National Society, as the Central Council of the Church for Religious Education with a theoretical responsibility for teacher-training, would seek to exercise that responsibility and bring about that much closer involvement with the colleges which it had enjoyed before the Board of Supervision had come into being. Canon Partridge, in commending the reorganisation to the Assembly, had deprecated, with not too much conviction one feels, the policy-making role the Central Board had been forced into playing, and especially in relation to the training colleges. He declared that 'a financing body dealing with a subject, if uncontrolled by experts in that particular subject, formulated the policy in that particular department', and he thought it was a profound error on the part of the Assembly to allow such a state of things to continue.¹

The Bishop of Gloucester had expressed the same point of view in stressing that the motivation behind the proposed changes was the need to preserve the autonomy of education administration and to prevent it becoming merely an activity of the Central Board of Finance.² The likelihood, however, of the Central Council assuming policy direction in relation to the training colleges, which had become the responsibility of the Board of Supervision and the Central Board, was remote, for it lacked the resources. The attempt was, however, made. The Board of Supervision was not in fact consulted about the change in the Society's

1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XIV, No. 3, 1933, p. 495.

2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 14, 4.3.1931, p. 331.

status, but the last resolution of the unreorganised Standing Committee of the National Society called the attention of the new Committee to 'the desirability of a better adjustment of the work of the Board of Supervision' with that of the Society.¹ The Report of the Commission on Religious Education in, misleadingly, describing the functions of the Board of Supervision as 'advisory', had obviously not envisaged difficulty in bringing about that adjustment.²

The Central Council, in anticipation of closer involvement with the training colleges, included them together with universities, adult education, secondary education and theological colleges, as being the responsibility of its Higher Education Committee. The possibility of exercising real responsibility in relation to the training colleges faded, however, when the Archbishop of Canterbury indicated to the Bishop of Peterborough that he wished the Board of Supervision to carry on its work, though he hoped that it would work in close co-operation with the Higher Education Committee.³

That hope was not to be fulfilled, except insofar as in the Bishop of Peterborough the two bodies shared a common Chairman, for there is no evidence that the Board of Supervision felt any necessity to consult the other body. The Society had to content

1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 15, 2.5.1934, p. 27.

2 Church Assembly: Minutes of Proceedings, Autumn 1929, Report of the Commission on Religious Education, C.A. 301, p. 150.

3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 15, 20.2.1935, p. 72.

itself with entrusting to the Higher Education Committee the general oversight of matters affecting the colleges for which it had a responsibility, i.e. St. Mark and St. John, Whitelands, and Carmarthen, of which the Society was Trustee¹, and in 1936, responsibility for the Archbishops' Examination in Religious Knowledge.² From the little that is reported of the activities of the Higher Education Committee up to 1939, it appears to have achieved little, but this is hardly surprising, as it had been recognised in the discussions leading up to the formation of the Central Council that it would be some time before ways and means were found to enable the Council to undertake new work.³

The irony of a central educational body not having responsibility for a major area of the Church's educational work, and an area with which the Society had a long and continuing connection, did not go unremarked, and the Dean of St. Albans proved to be a doughty fighter on behalf of the Society. Wanting perhaps to bring matters to a head, he moved that its Annual Report in 1937 should omit a report on the colleges, 'inasmuch as the National Society is not directly responsible for the work, policy and opinions of the Board of Supervision'.⁴ The motion was lost, but

1 National Society: Annual Report, 1935, p. 15.

2 National Society: Annual Report, 1938, p. 28.

3 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XIII, No. 3, 1932, p. 458.

4 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 15, 22.4.1937, p. 210.

he returned to the fray a few months later, clearly feeling that the Society had not been fully consulted with regard to the Concentration plans, which by this time had been finalised, and requested that the Society members of the Board of Supervision should inform the Standing Committee of what had been proposed.¹

In 1939 the Dean, by that time Treasurer of the Society, was able to carry the Standing Committee with him in a resolution asking the Archbishop of Canterbury to take appropriate steps to relate the work of the Board of Supervision more closely to the Central Council, 'in view of the key position held by the Church Training Colleges in the educational work of the Church'. This was, however, a toned-down version of the motion of which he had given notice at the previous meeting, asking the Archbishop 'to take such steps as may be necessary to bring the government of the Church Training Colleges under the direct control of the National Society as the Central Council of the Church for Religious Education'.²

There was no response, and the Central Board of Finance made its continuing responsibility clear, in response to a resolution from the Society that it should be consulted before educational questions were discussed at diocesan meetings arranged by the Central Board. The reply is a strong statement of the Board's own authority. It points to the Board's large financial interests

1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 15, 8.7.1937, p. 226.

2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 15, 1.2.1939, p. 410.

in the organisation and property of the training colleges, 'under a body independent of the National Society', and comments that as the usefulness of the colleges for religious education depended on the character of the schools from which students came, the Board was intimately concerned with all such schools. The real denial of the overall responsibility which the Central Council had in theory been given is, however, contained in the statement that 'both the Central Board and the National Society can advise the Church Assembly on religious education. It is sometimes advisable and sometimes inadvisable that the two should have consulted beforehand'. Co-operation was promised, but 'as and where the Board may consider it to be desirable'.¹

There the matter rested, but did not end, at the outbreak of war in 1939. The National Society was clearly unhappy that the attempt to extend its responsibilities in the sphere of teacher-training was making no headway. Equally clearly, in spite of Canon Partridge's disclaimer, the Central Board of Finance, holding the purse-strings, had preferred to continue to make policy with the Board of Supervision rather than to place its full confidence in the Central Council.

1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 15, 27.4.1939, p. 423.

SECTION IV

HOW THE OTHER DENOMINATIONAL COLLEGES FARED

CHAPTER 1

COMMON PROBLEMS

The problems faced by the Roman Catholic and Methodist colleges in the decade following 1929, as a result of Government economies and the reduction in the numbers admitted to training courses, and dependent on a grant system based on capitation, were the same as those experienced by the Church of England colleges. The Methodists had only two colleges, both advantageously placed in London, and the Roman Catholics eight. That is not to say that the problems for the denominational communities, much smaller than their Anglican counterparts, were not serious. They chose, however, to respond in a different way, and there was no questioning of the decisions of the controlling central bodies.

The responsibility of the Catholic Education Council, as the advisory body to the Bishops on all matters affecting training colleges, was recognised and accepted, even though the Council owned only the one college for men and contributed very little in financial terms to the remaining seven colleges, owned and maintained by the religious communities which ran them. It was likewise recognised that the Methodist Education Committee had oversight of the finances of its two colleges, Westminster and Southlands. While there is no doubt that the Board of Education welcomed the closure of Church of England colleges as a solution to the difficulties confronting them all, the evidence points to the Board adopting a sympathetic attitude towards the determined

efforts of the other denominations to keep all their colleges open.

The Methodists began the decade with a large mortgage on the new Southlands College, having spent £60,000 transferring from Battersea to Wimbledon, and an adverse balance of £37,032 on the Westminster College account.¹ The Catholic Education Council at the same time was contemplating an extension at Strawberry Hill which was to provide 50 study-bedrooms at a cost of £14,000. It was also facing a situation, which was to be repeated each year throughout the decade, in which the amount paid out in grants to colleges exceeded the amount taken in the annual collections for training college work.² The financial position of neither group could therefore be described as healthy.

The authorities thus viewed with a dismay equal to that expressed by the Church of England authorities the further threat to that position posed by the cuts in admission announced for 1932 and 1933, especially coming so soon after the colleges had responded to the Board of Education's earnest request to take additional students, thereby contributing to the total of 570 additional places offered by the Voluntary colleges for 1929³,

1 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1929-30, pp. 13, 162.

2 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1929, pp. 22, 30. These amounts were never large. The average paid to the women's colleges never exceeded £140 and went as low as £110 after 1934. St. Mary's received £900 per annum to enable it to pay off the £9,000 loan towards the new wing.

3 Education in 1929: Report of the Board of Education, p. 52.

and 415 for 1930.¹ The authorities, unlike their Anglican counterparts, recognised however that circumstances had changed with the failure to raise the school-leaving age. The Catholic Education Council's response to the 2½% reduction for 1932 was to decide to make representations only with regard to the private students from religious communities training at Strawberry Hill. The Board of Education had decided that they should be reduced from 52 to 20², but in response to the representations said it would be prepared to recognise 25 as private students if the college waived its claim to the proposed relief grant, and this offer was accepted.³ The Principal felt that special consideration had been shown to St. Mary's because the number of recognised students was reduced only from 200 to 195.⁴ That does in fact represent a 2½% cut as expected. It may be that the Principal had been expecting a reduction on the numbers for which the college had been recognised before the completion of the new wing in 1930, or that he was relieved that there was no reduction in the number of Northern Ireland students, 35, for which the college was also recognised.⁵

-
- 1 Education in 1930: Report of the Board of Education, p. 59.
 - 2 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1931, pp. 34, 18.
 - 3 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1932, p. 20.
 - 4 St. Mary's College (1950) Centenary Record of St. Mary's College, Hammersmith, 1850-1925, Strawberry Hill, 1925-50, p. 67.
 - 5 Ibid., p. 66.

The 10% cut ordered for 1933, however, represented serious financial loss of capitation grants and fees. Circular 1420, ordering the reduction, had indicated that the Board of Education was prepared to consider proposals for varying the amount of reduction within a group of colleges. Dr. Workman¹, Secretary of the Methodist Education Committee, pointed out that he did not at that time see any possibility of combination with any other group to effect such a reduction, but that he was considering the matter. He was perhaps envisaging the possibility of coming to an arrangement with the undenominational colleges of the British and Foreign School Society, but there is no evidence of any discussions having taken place.² Fears were not expressed about Westminster, which it was felt could always fill with students other than those training to be teachers, but it was thought that Southlands would be more difficult to fill. Thus while Southlands welcomed the proposed 'relief grant' Westminster preferred instead to ask to be allowed to make the 10% cut over two years.³

The Catholic Education Council made a very positive response to the threat posed by the reduction in numbers. After consulting

-
- 1 On his retirement as Principal of Westminster in 1930, Dr. Workman continued as Secretary of the Education Committee, a post he had held in an honorary capacity since 1921.
 - 2 The Society requested that its colleges at Stockwell and Saffron Walden be treated as one, and in both 1933 and 1934 the cuts were made entirely at Stockwell. ED 86/57 Interview memorandum, 10.11.1932, and letter to Pelham, 12.2.1934. Public Record Office.
 - 3 ED 86/61 Westminster and Southlands Training Colleges. Interview Memoranda, 26.7.1932, 10.11.1932. Public Record Office.

the Cardinal, the Board of Education was informed that the Council would not consent to the closure of any college as a solution to the problems.¹ It was a clear, uncompromising statement reminiscent of the stand taken by the hierarchy at the time of the crisis over the 1907 Regulations.

The failure of the Church Assembly to agree to closure of Church of England colleges in 1932 placed the Board of Education in a difficult position with regard to payment of the promised 'relief grant'. The Treasury had been persuaded to agree to such payment only on the ground that it would ease closure of some colleges, and the Board decided not to press for the payment of the grant in the altered circumstances. The choice was between paying to all the colleges or to none, and the view of Lord Irwin, President of the Board, was that to pay to the Church of England colleges in those circumstances would be a 'very undeserved reward to the Assembly' for its action. Hence, in his words, 'no closure, no loot'. He recognised, however, that such a decision, arrived at because of what was considered an ill-advised decision by the Church of England, would be very hard luck on the Roman Catholic and Nonconformist colleges, and advised that help should be given to them in the way of 'oiling the wheels as much as possible'.²

1 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1932, p. 20.

2 ED 24/1936 Denominational Training College Papers. Notes after Assembly vote, 13.2.1933. Public Record Office.

Pelham informed the Secretary of the Catholic Education Council, Sir John Gilbert¹, that the grant he might have been expecting 'had come to him by a windfall and now he would lose it as the effect of another windfall'.² It was not all loss, however, for the Roman Catholics saw the withdrawal of the 1933 Regulations as not without advantage to them. The provision authorising the Board to close a college had apparently been felt by the Council to pose a threat to the continued existence of Selly Park college, although the Annual Reports give no indication of the cause of anxiety. It was felt also that the principle of treating the Catholic colleges and the Church of England colleges alike represented a possible gain to the former.³

The announcement of a further 8% cut in admissions, in July 1933, increased the authorities' concern. Dr. Workman put forward to the Board of Education a scheme designed to go some way towards retrieving Southlands' loss of £1,587 in 1933 and meeting the expected loss of £2,750 in 1934.⁴ The plan was to put intending

-
- 1 Sir John Gilbert succeeded Sir Francis Anderton in 1926 and held office for ten years.
 - 2 ED 24/1934 Economy Measures, Church of England Colleges. Letter from Mr. Holland to Archbishop of Canterbury, 17.2.1933. Public Record Office.
 - 3 ED 24/1936 Denominational Training College Papers. Minute Paper, E.H. Pelham after interview with Sir John Gilbert, 17.2.1933. Public Record Office.
 - 4 ED 86/61 Note from Meeting of Methodist Education Committee, 3.11.1933. Public Record Office.

teachers through a preliminary year, with the emphasis on teaching practice, and to charge £50 or £60. It is difficult to see whence it was hoped to recruit for such a course, but in any case the idea was regarded by the Board as raising the whole question of a three-year course and it received no encouragement. At the same time, however, Dr. Workman was suggesting that the cuts should be heavier in the women's colleges because a reduction in the child population first made itself felt in Infant schools.¹

Roman Catholic and Methodist representatives joined the deputation from the Voluntary colleges to the President of the Board of Education in October to press for the stabilisation of grants. The President, as we have seen², saw no possibility of the Board of Education agreeing to such a stabilisation, but indicated his willingness to make some representation to the Treasury with regard to the further proposed reduction, provided that colleges showed there was no possibility of increasing fees or making further economies.³

The attempt to secure a uniform increase of fees was made by the Board of Supervision following the report of the Committee of Enquiry in December 1933, with its suggestion of a Common Fund for the Church of England colleges and fees of £50. At a conference at the National Society's offices with representatives of other

1 ED 86/61 Interview Memorandum, 3.7.1933. Public Record Office.

2 See p. 324.

3 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1933, p. 19.

Voluntary and L.E.A. colleges, the view of all but the Anglican representatives was that a policy of uniformity was neither practicable nor desirable. The Roman Catholics agreed with the L.E.A. representatives that no action should be taken which would seem to deny the children of working-class parents the opportunity to enter the teaching profession. Conscious that the Catholic colleges drew their students in the main from the lower social classes, their representatives argued that the raising of their fees, from the current £27.10.00 at most colleges to the proposed £50, would empty the colleges, and that to make further economies in staffing would affect efficiency.¹ The L.E.A.s' attitude, in the case of their own colleges, was that owing to the working of the grant formula an increase might bring only slight advantage, as the majority of students would be unable to pay further fees and so any increase would fall on the L.E.A.s. In the case of students attending Voluntary colleges with the help of L.E.A. loans, some L.E.A.s indicated that they were unwilling to increase commitments under that heading.²

There was, however, some raising of fees in response to the President of the Board of Education's appeal in October. At Westminster fees went up from £43.10.00 to £50, and Southlands

-
- 1 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with the Board of Education: Notes on Board of Education Conference with representatives of Voluntary and L.E.A. Training Colleges, 14.12.1933.
 - 2 ED 86/56 Conference with Representatives of Voluntary and L.E.A. Training Colleges, 14.12.1933. Public Record Office.

increased its fees from £48.16.00 to £52.10.00.¹ The Roman Catholic Principals, perhaps encouraged by the reported lack of prejudicial effect on recruitment of the Anglican decision to raise fees, agreed to propose an increase to £35 in 1934 and £40 in 1935, subject to sanction by the Congregations owning the colleges.² Not all colleges fell in with this proposal. Strawberry Hill raised fees to £50 in 1934³, and Mount Pleasant raised theirs to £27.10.00 in 1933 and £30 in 1934.⁴

Neither the Roman Catholics nor the Methodists felt it necessary or desirable to initiate a pooling scheme of the type into which the Church of England colleges reluctantly entered in 1934, and there was considerable sympathy at the Board of Education with their situation, where it was recognised that the relief grant of £20 per student lost would not go far unless the college were part of a group. The President raised the question of giving the non-poolable colleges more than their mathematical share, but Pelham, while acknowledging that a uniform rate of grant was not equitable, regarded it as unavoidable, finding it 'difficult to do other than have regard primarily to the position of the Church (of England) Training Colleges'.⁵

-
- 1 ED 24/1936 Note on Wesleyan Colleges, 17.2.1934. Public Record Office.
 - 2 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1933, p. 19.
 - 3 St. Mary's College (1950) Centenary Record, p. 67.
 - 4 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1933, p. 67.
 - 5 ED 24/1936 Denominational Training Colleges. Minute Paper, 13.2.1934. Public Record Office.

It was found possible, however, to make a gesture towards the Methodist colleges. Westminster, which took only four-year students, was permitted the concession granted to University Departments of Education, where the two reductions of 10% and 8% were spread equally over three years.¹ At Southlands, the Board of Education counted the third-year students as supernumerary.² These concessions clearly came under the description of 'oiling the wheels', which the Board had expressed its willingness to do in 1933.

In a series of letters which passed between Mr. Runciman, President of the Board of Trade and Treasurer of the Methodist Education Fund, and Lord Halifax in 1934, the complaint was voiced that there was inadequate recognition of the needs of the Voluntary colleges as a whole, and a gloomy picture was painted of the future of the Methodist colleges, crippled by debt, in particular. Mr. Oppé of the Board, in a Minute Paper rejecting the figures on which Mr. Runciman had based his argument, expressed the hope that 'he was better served as President of the Board of Trade than as Treasurer of the Wesleyan Education Committee'³, and Lord Halifax, replying to Runciman, rejected the complaint and expressed his confidence that the financial position gave no ground for anticipating that the work of the Voluntary colleges would be brought to a standstill.⁴

1 Education in 1933: Report of the Board of Education, p. 55.

2 ED 24/1936 Denominational Training College Papers. Minute Paper, 21.2.1934. Public Record Office.

3 ED 24/1936 Minute Paper, 9.3.1934. Public Record Office.

4 ED 24/1936 Letter dated 13.3.1934. Public Record Office.

The colleges did, of course, survive. Southlands was granted a temporary reduction of interest payable on its mortgage, and both colleges exploited their premises to ease the financial situation. Southlands was able to offer accommodation to girls coming to London for training courses other than teaching, and Westminster welcomed the opportunity which a mixture of university students was able to provide.¹ Vacation conferences were another source of income at Southlands, helping to keep down the deficit on the college's current account in 1935-36, though the college still had a heavy mortgage. By 1936, the situation had also eased at Westminster.² In 1938 we see another example of the Board of Education 'oiling the wheels', when Southlands was able to fill with students on a special three months Physical Education course approved by the Board.³

The problems of the Methodist Education Committee were exacerbated in 1938 by a change in its method of funding by the Methodist Conference. From that time it was to receive an income of £5,000 per annum from General Assessment, compared with more than £9,000 previously through collections, and an urgent appeal was made for subscriptions.⁴ The only way out of the financial problems of both colleges seemed to be to move the men out of central London and to sell the Westminster buildings. A generous

1 Wesleyan Committee of Education: Report, 1934-35, pp. 20, 28.

2 Methodist Education Committee: Report, 1935-36, pp. 27, 32.

3 Methodist Education Committee: Report, 1938-39, p. 35.

4 Ibid., p. 10.

offer in 1938 for Southlands, to turn into a nursing home, was however resisted.¹ The Westminster buildings, erected in 1851, were no longer adequate and, despite a certain amount of modernisation carried out between 1929 and 1935, the accommodation could not be made suitable except at considerable further expense. The sale of the Westminster site, it was decided, would pay the debt on the college, provide temporary accommodation and a new college and enable a contribution to be made to the completion of the equipping of Southlands.² It was considered essential, however, to maintain the London University link. A site was found near Bromley in 1939, and the decision to sell was reinforced by the H.M.I.s' General Inspection Report, the first since 1924, in which the premises were treated in a drastic way.³ The intention was that H.M. Office of Works would take over the Horseferry Road site in September 1940, but it was not to be.⁴

The Roman Catholic colleges, with the raising of fees and taking private students, also survived. It was agreed to admit Scottish candidates to Strawberry Hill, with reversion of places to English and Welsh candidates if the college were once more recognised for the number it had enjoyed in 1931. With that help, the college was able to reduce its 1934 deficit of £5,025 to £448 in 1939.⁵

1 E. Williams (1972) The History of Southlands College, 1872-1972, p. 69.

2 Methodist Education Committee: Report, 1938-39, p. 33.

3 Ibid., p. 38.

4 F.C. Pritchard (1951) The Story of Westminster College, 1851-1951, p. 175.

5 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1939, p. 26.

The Annual Reports for the years to 1939 show also in fact that there was not a standstill on improvements, the women's colleges obviously drawing on the financial resources of the communities which controlled them. As Carrigan points out, the Catholic colleges seem to have made generally better provision of facilities than other Voluntary colleges.¹ The college at Sedgley Park was able to open a new hostel in 1934 and Mount Pleasant was able to afford interior improvements in 1936. Hull provided a new gymnasium in 1937 in a successful bid to become the only Catholic women's college approved for an Advanced Physical Education course. Strawberry Hill cautiously decided not to spend £20,000 on a better gymnasium and swimming bath as suggested by H.M. Inspectors in 1938, but did spend £2,000 enlarging and equipping rooms for handwork. In the same year, North Kensington completed its plan to provide separate rooms for all students, with the conversion of a large dormitory into study-bedrooms.

The comments by the Catholic Education Council on the full Inspection Reports on Hull, North Kensington and Sedgley Park in 1939 suggest that the three colleges were found to be generally satisfactory, and confirm the impression that by 1939 the colleges had surmounted the difficulties of the early part of the decade and were set for steady progress.

1 D. Carrigan (1961) *The Catholic Teachers' Colleges in the United Kingdom, 1850-1960*, p. 117.

The urban setting of the Catholic and Methodist colleges meant that the upheaval caused by the outbreak of war was considerable, and so another crisis was upon the colleges.

PART 5

PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE, 1939-1944

CHAPTER 1

WAR MOVES

The false hopes of international peace in 1938 may have lulled the college authorities into thinking that they were to be granted that period of stability which, having survived the difficulties of the earlier years of the decade, they so earnestly desired. The plans for the improvement of the Church of England colleges were taken off the shelf to which they had been consigned in 1931, and the National Society confidently announced that the Scheme II Committee was again at work.¹ Grants were made and in some cases building was begun, but again the colleges were to be disappointed, and none more so than the recurrently unfortunate Culham, which had at last succeeded in securing approval for the complete modernisation of the college.²

The outbreak of war in 1939 ended the hopes of stability and improvement and, in Lord Grey's words, 'threw everything back into the melting pot'.³ It signalled a period of upheaval for the men's colleges, as in 1914-18, but also for many of the colleges for women, which had suffered little in that period. Women were, as in 1914-18, urged to regard teaching as a national service, but the call to arms took on a different note from that

1 National Society: Annual Report, 1939, p. 19.

2 L. Naylor (1953) Culham, 1853-1953, p. 131.

3 Church Assembly: C.A.F. 162, C.B.F. Annual Report, 1939, p. 14.

sounded in the earlier conflict. It was, says Webster, 'a matter of having to undertake an unexpected job of work'.¹

As early as February 1939, there was a conference at the Board of Education on the use of training college premises in war-time, and plans were drawn up to remove the women's colleges in evacuation areas to men's colleges in reception areas.² The evacuation plans were nullified, however, by the decision not to call up men before the age of twenty, and the confusion caused in the early weeks of the war by the realisation that the policy which had been planned was unsuitable, and by the consequent relaxation of the embargo on colleges assembling in evacuation areas, unless their premises had been requisitioned, is described by Gosden.³

The relaxation enabled Whitelands, St. Gabriel's and Tottenham to remain, initially, in London. The students at Derby were, however, evacuated to Elvaston Castle, in the Derbyshire countryside, before the embargo was lifted, and those from Liverpool were moved to Keswick when the college was commandeered for hospital purposes. The College of St. Mark and St. John, and St. Paul's, Cheltenham, were requisitioned in 1939 and their students transferred. Those from St. Mark's were divided between Exeter and

1 D.E. Webster (1973) Bede College, p. 55.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 5, 30.3.1939, p. 93.

3 P.H.J.H. Gosden (1976) Education in the Second World War, p. 111.

Borough Road, and those from Cheltenham between York and Saltley.¹ St. Paul's was released in September 1940 and its students were joined by those of St. Mark and St. John. Winchester was taken over for military purposes in June 1940 and the students went to Culham and Saltley. The financial arrangement in connection with such moves was that colleges receiving students should not make a profit out of the misfortunes of others. They were to charge as much as the students cost, and the remaining income was to be retained by the college of origin.²

Characteristically, the Board of Supervision lost no time in approaching the Board of Education to ask for help for colleges financially embarrassed as a result of war conditions, on the ground that it was 'in the highest national educational interest' that during the war the colleges should receive the aid necessary to prevent them losing ground.³ The Board of Education responded sympathetically to the information about the financial state of the colleges, requested through the Board of Supervision, the Catholic Education Council and the Methodist Education Committee, and agreed to provide a deficiency grant, payable where colleges were unable to balance their accounts as a result of evacuation or small numbers.⁴

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 5, 2.11.1939, p. 127.

2 Ibid., p. 130.

3 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letter dated 8.4.1940.

4 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 6, 1.7.1943, p. 124.

The promise of that support could have been of little comfort, however, to colleges uprooted from their place of work, as many of the women's colleges were. The Roman Catholic colleges, all in urban areas, were, as a group, the most affected. Selly Park moved from Birmingham to Stonehouse in Gloucestershire in 1939, and St. Charles' moved from North Kensington to Cold Ash, Newbury.¹ 1940 found students moved from Hull to Allerthorpe, York, and those from Mount Pleasant divided between Worth Priory in Sussex, and Harlech. Hexham became home for St. Mary's, Fenham, and Charlton Park, Cheltenham, provided shelter for the students from Southampton.²

A number of Church of England colleges for women were also affected however, in addition to Derby and St. Katharine's, Liverpool. Whitelands was unable to reassemble in its own premises in September 1940, as they were used to house refugees from Gibraltar, and the students were sent to Homerton and to Halifax.³ War damage was suffered by St. Gabriel's, whose students were moved to various buildings in Doncaster in 1940, and three students were killed by a bomb falling on the college at Bishop's Stortford in 1940. St. Katharine's, Tottenham, moved to three hotels in Babbacombe in 1941, and Norwich suffered from enemy action in 1942.⁴

1 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1939, pp. 51, 57.

2 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1940, pp. 46ff.

3 National Society: Annual Report, 1941, p. 6.

4 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 6, 2.7.1942, p. 78.

Bishop Otter College, requisitioned by the Air Ministry in 1942, made a surprising move from its safety in Chichester to the Old Palace, Bromley, vacated by the British and Foreign School Society's Stockwell College for the safer haven of Torquay.¹

The Methodist college for women, Southlands, also sought refuge at the seaside and, with their London property damaged by a landmine, moved to Weston super Mare in 1940.² Another surprising move was that of St. Mary's, Cheltenham, its buildings requisitioned in 1939, to the remoteness of Llandrindod Wells, until it was able to return in January 1941 to the Fullwood Park site, where its scheme of rebuilding, in an advanced state at the end of 1939, had been completed.³

All was not loss, however. Challinor acknowledges that the evacuation to Llandrindod Wells helped to break down the restrictions of college life, 'and they were not re-imposed'.⁴ Those restrictions, more true of the women's than of the men's colleges, had been characterised by L.C. Knights in 1932 as leading to 'an arrested juvenility', and a training college life which was 'a prolonged and hopeless childhood', and he described a college as a cross between a barracks and a nursery, in which young men and women were not helped to maturity and responsibility by attempts

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 6, 2.3.1944, p. 143.

2 Methodist Education Committee: Report, 1939-40, 1940-41, p. 40.

3 E.B. Challinor (1978) The Story of St. Mary's College, Cheltenham, p. 57.

4 Ibid., p. 55.

'to break their spirit and destroy their self-respect'.¹ One must not claim too much for the war years as effecting change, but the 'increasingly greater freedom to order their lives', which the move to Weston super Mare gave to the students of Southlands, might fairly be claimed as a consequence for other students working in evacuation conditions.² As an example, the evening lecture timetable did not survive the evacuation of the students from Derby.³

Colleges which did not evacuate did not remain untouched. The presence of Hull Municipal Training College students at Ripon, and the necessity of teaching evacuee children, would not have been without some effect on an isolated college where the need for more personal freedom had been commented on by the Inspectors in 1934⁴, and Portsmouth Training College's move to Chichester, before the latter's evacuation, must have led to further relaxation of what, according to McGregor, was already a comparatively liberal regime. The two colleges ran separately, facilities were available only at certain times and a considerable

-
- 1 L.C. Knights: Scrutiny, Vol. 1, No. 3, December 1932, pp. 255, 258 and 263.
 - 2 E. Williams (1972) The History of Southlands College, 1872-1972, p. 71.
 - 3 M. Dobson (1951) The First Hundred Years of the Diocesan Training College, Derby, p. 60.
 - 4 A.M. Wilkinson (1963) Ripon Training College, 1862-1962, pp. 81, 84.

amount of responsibility was thus thrust upon the students.¹

Something very positive emerged from Tottenham's move to Babbacombe, for there the value of mature students was recognised. The importance of the work in this field was acknowledged by the Board of Education, and the college helped to pioneer the training in Emergency Colleges which came into being after the war.² The experience of evacuation to Somerset served to confirm the view of the Principal of Southlands that London had much more to offer to students in training.³

The men's colleges were of course progressively affected by the call-up of young men, and from time to time, as the Ministry of Labour changed policy about the length of time it would allow students to have deferment, the Board of Education altered the regulations concerning admission and length of course. In November 1939 the minimum age of admission for men was reduced to 17 and the minimum period of training reduced to five terms.⁴

The age of enlistment was reduced from 20 to 19 in 1941, but colleges were protected from indiscriminate recruitment to H.M. Forces by the placing of students admitted in 1940 under the age of eighteen and a half, and of those entering in 1941

1 . G.P. McGregor (1981) Bishop Otter College, 1839-1980, p. 172.

2 G. Handley (1978) The College of All Saints, 1878-1978, p. 24.

3 Methodist Education Committee: Report, 1941-42, p. 32.

4 P.H.J.H. Gosden (1976) Education in the Second World War, p. 112.

under the age of eighteen, in the category of 'reserved occupation' until they had completed five terms.¹

These provisions were, however, of limited effect in aiding recruitment, and Hussey complained that Secondary school heads were not co-operating, wanting to keep their boys as long as possible.² Gosden shows that there was a steady decline in the number of men admitted, from 1,390 in 1938 to 1,254 in 1940, and then a sharp fall in the number of applications received by December 1940 for entry in 1941, 468, and a further decline in the following year, to 168.³ By 1942-43, the colleges' worst year, the number of male students was less than one quarter of the 1938-39 total. The reduction of the age of call-up to 18 in 1943 brought agreement that a student admitted under the age of 18 would be reserved up to the end of the term in which he became nineteen⁴, and the recruitment situation began to improve.

The decline in recruitment to the women's colleges, from the 3,591 admitted in 1938, was of course much less marked, but enough to cause concern, as school leavers were attracted to other forms of national service. Applications for admission in

-
- 1 Board of Education: Circular 1550, 6.5.1941.
 - 2 Board of Supervision, National Emergency and Concentration of Colleges Correspondence: letter to Spencer Leeson, 26.1.1940.
 - 3 P.H.J.H. Gosden (1976) Education in the Second World War, p. 112.
 - 4 Board of Education: Circular 1621, 15.2.1943.

1941 received by December 1940 numbered 2,341, for 2,993 places¹, and there was a further decline in the following year, to 2,102. The situation was remedied in 1943 by the lowering of the age of admission for women to 17½², and the conditions for admission to training colleges in 1944 remained similar to those for 1943.

The Board of Supervision hastened to state that as a matter of general policy it would not itself initiate any move for temporary Concentration, and that only if a college were unable to carry on would it intervene to make suggestions.³ A significant feature, however, of the discussion of arrangements for the Church of England colleges in this period was the overshadowing of the Board of Supervision by the Board of Education, in the person of Mr. S.H. Wood, the head of the Teacher Training Branch, who was a frequent attender at the Board of Supervision's meetings in the early years of the war.

The shortage of male candidates for admission in September 1941 caused Mr. Wood to take the initiative and to make definite proposals for Concentration, which he had, however, fully discussed beforehand with Mr. Hussey.⁴ In March, Wood suggested that the retention of two colleges in England and one in Wales would be

1 Board of Supervision, National Emergency Correspondence: letter from Hussey to Bishop of Peterborough, 17.1.1941.

2 Board of Education: Circular 1625, 16.3.1943.

3 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 6, 9.5.1940, p. 5.

4 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letter to Wood, 28.3.1941.

sufficient, and the Board of Supervision agreed with the choice of Cheltenham and of Bede, because of the latter's connection with Durham University. In May 1941, however, he invited comments on a proposal to recommend the temporary closure of Culham, Carmarthen, and two out of Exeter, Saltley and York. He expressed a wish to close as few colleges as possible, because of the difficulty of a quick recovery from occupation by some other body, but at the same time he was attracted by the possibility of being able to offer accommodation to women's colleges evacuated to unsuitable property. The Board of Supervision decided to recommend the closure of Exeter and Saltley. In the case of the former, it was on the good grounds that the college had few students and the Principal was of an age when he could conveniently retire.¹ Saltley was an obvious choice, because since it had been bombed in November 1940 it had become in effect a day college, with students in lodgings.²

Mr. Wood continued to exercise his initiative, in asking to meet all the Principals of the Church of England men's colleges to reassure them that they could rely on the Board of Education to deal with any special problems. They took him at his word, and at his meeting with them at the Board of Education on 20th May, a meeting which the Governors of Exeter instructed the Principal not to attend, and in the course of the following days, proceeded to

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 6, 1.5.1941, p. 30.

2 J. Osborne (ed.) (1950) Saltley College Centenary, 1850-1950, p. 54.

make disposition of the students. The background to the meeting was the furore over the proposal to close Exeter, which the college no doubt saw as the Board of Supervision's response to its oft-expressed hostility, and the campaign of opposition which threatened colleges had become adept at mounting.

At the meeting, a number of Principals suggested that Exeter should be retained, and the Principal of Saltley made it clear that he would rather combine with Exeter than with York. Mr. Hussey left the meeting, which he had attended by invitation, convinced that nothing had been settled, and wrote to Wood to say that he took it for granted that if there were any alterations to the proposed closure plan the Board of Supervision would first be consulted.¹

The consultation did not take place. The whole situation was changed by the Principal of Bede's offer, made after the meeting of 20th May, to send his two-year students to York, a voluntary Concentration welcomed by Mr. Wood. It was then agreed that Winchester students should all go to Carmarthen, thus saving that college from closure, that those from Saltley should go to Exeter, with both groups of students under Saltley's Principal, and that Culham students should go to Chester.²

1 Board of Supervision, National Emergency Correspondence: letter from Hussey to Peterborough, 21.5.1941.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 6, 11.6.1941, p. 37.

Hussey was quick to convey what he thought would be the reaction of the Board of Supervision. 'The Board will not be prepared to express acquiescence in, or recommendation for, the plan you propose', he wrote to Wood, and in a letter to the Bishop of Peterborough describing Bede's action as committing hari-kari, he left him in no doubt of his opinion that if any college were to benefit from that action it should be Culham rather than Exeter.¹

By the time that the Board of Supervision met on 11th June to consider the changed circumstances, the President of the Board of Education himself had decided to withdraw the threat of closure of Exeter, and the college had been so informed. A decision had also been made, in response to a plea from the Governing Body of Bede, that the Board would not press for closure of the college.² The plea suggests that the Principal's offer to send the students to York had been made without their approval.

All that was left for the Board of Supervision was to agree that Whitelands' students should occupy Bede, and to comment that it 'could not do otherwise than accept the arrangements which had been made between the respective colleges, and acquiesce in the Exeter decision by the Board of Education'.³

1 Board of Supervision, National Emergency Correspondence: letters dated 28.5.1941, 29.5.1941.

2 Ibid., letter from S.H. Wood to Hussey, 3.6.1941.

3 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 6, 11.6.1941, p. 37.

There was a similar occurrence in relation to Norwich and Fishponds in 1942. Both colleges were short of students, and the Board of Supervision expressed its anxiety about this. The colleges felt threatened by the Board's intervention and conveyed their protest in what Mr. Hussey described as 'two violent letters' from the Principals.¹ Mr. Wood wished both colleges to remain open and was particularly concerned that the specialised work of Fishponds in training for nursery work and for rural schools should continue. The Board of Supervision assumed, however, after Norwich had been bombed in 1942, that the position would alter, and urged the college to take up residence with Fishponds, promising that 'no appeal for the present building would be supported by the Board'.² The Chairman of the Norwich Governors, who was to offer the college a new home, was determined that the college should remain open unless the issue were forced by the Board of Education.³ The issue was not forced, however, and Norwich remained, with the full approval of the Board. The Board of Supervision thought that the Norwich decision would surely affect the position of Fishponds, but again the Board of Education's decision was otherwise, Mr. Wood seeing spare accommodation at Fishponds as something of an advantage if other colleges were to suffer from enemy action.⁴ The Board of Supervision did not have

-
- 1 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letter to Wood, 13.4.1942.
 - 2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 6, 2.7.1942, p. 78.
 - 3 C.M.B. Johnson (1957) Keswick Hall, 1817-1957, p. 7.
 - 4 Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education: letter dated 6.7.1942.

the confidence of the colleges it was seeking to serve, and its overshadowing in this period is one of the preliminaries to its disappearance, or rather, transformation, towards the end of the war.

The decisive intervention of the Board of Education in the case of Exeter in 1941 was not, however, as decisive as the almost complete destruction of the college by fire after a raid in 1942. The students left for Cheltenham to join those from Chelsea, Chester, closed in 1942, and Culham, colleges which, says Beck, writing of Cheltenham, 'federated with us for short or long periods in the war years', with the colleges retaining their separate identities.¹ Cheltenham, York and Carmarthen remained the centres of Concentration for the Church of England colleges in 1943 and 1944, although the students of St. Mark and St. John managed to return to London in 1943 and again joined forces with Borough Road.

The Roman Catholic college at Strawberry Hill dug its air raid shelters in 1939, 'care having been taken to ensure that the amenities of the college grounds and playing fields should not in any way be affected', and resolved to stay.² And in spite of the college being damaged severely in November 1940, losing 91 bedrooms and three lecture rooms, classes continued almost as usual,

1 W.E. Beck (1947) History of the Cheltenham Training Colleges, St. Paul and St. Mary, p. 23.

2 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1939, p. 49.

although from 1943 flying bombs made life difficult.¹ The upheaval caused to Westminster College must have strained all feelings of unity, for the college operated in four centres. It was evacuated to Bristol in 1940, along with King's College, but students were also at Aberystwyth, Cambridge and Bangor.² As a four-year college for men only, its recruitment was very seriously affected by the war and it had a total of only 45 students in 1941, by which time the headquarters had been moved from Bristol to an office in the hostel occupied by St. Mark and St. John students at Cheltenham.³ Unity was preserved by the visits of the Principal to his students and by the college magazine, until students returned to London in 1942 to take up residence at Borough Road. The severe damage caused to the Westminster property by bombing in 1944 must have been a bitter blow.⁴

1944 found the Church colleges in disarray, with students scattered into exile, many buildings requisitioned or in use by others, and having suffered much more material damage than in 1914-1918.⁵ The first challenge therefore was a material

1 St. Mary's College (1950) Centenary Record, pp. 73, 77.

2 Methodist Education Committee: Report, 1939-40, 1940-41, p. 30.

3 Methodist Education Committee: Report, 1941-42, p. 22.

4 F.C. Pritchard (1951) The Story of Westminster College, 1851-1951, p. 186.

5 Church of England colleges still occupied in 1944 included Chester, Chelsea, Chichester, Tottenham, Liverpool, Whitelands, Culham, Saltley, St. Gabriel's and Derby. Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 6, 2.3.1944, p. 145. Southlands was in the hands of the War Office and the Roman Catholic college at Southampton was occupied by a company working for the Ministry of Aircraft Production. P.H.J.H. Gosden (1976) Education in the Second World War, pp. 115, 468.

challenge, which would have to be met if the colleges were to take their place in that coherent training service for the nation which the McNair Committee, in its Report published in May 1944, advocated.

CHAPTER 2

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND COLLEGES: THE NEED FOR ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGE

It became clear as early as 1941, with the distribution of the Board of Education's discussion document, *Education After The War*¹, that the end of hostilities would see a comprehensive reform of the English educational system and of teacher-training within it. It was with this certainty in mind, and in a climate in which reform was being widely discussed, that the Church of England worked its way towards putting its central administrative machinery in a position to enable the training colleges to make an effective contribution in the post-war world. In the process, the Board of Supervision and the General Council of the Church Training Colleges were transmuted, and the wish of the National Society to extend its authority in the sphere of the colleges was dismissed, as a preliminary to the dismissal of the Society itself as the Central Council of the Church for Religious Education.

The Society included in a statement of its aims in 1941 that it wished 'to secure closer co-ordination' between itself and the Board of Supervision², a wish it had been expressing ever since it had become the Central Council. Teacher-training, optimistically,

-
- 1 Never published, and marked 'strictly confidential, for official use only', with a restricted circulation.
 - 2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 16, 6.2.1941, p. 144.

became one of the sectional responsibilities when the Society's committee structure was reorganised in 1942, after a committee, referred to as the Committee of Six, under Sir Walter Moberley, had recommended that it would make for more effective working if there were only one Education Committee, co-ordinating the work of sub-committees, rather than all decisions of separate committees having to wait upon the Standing Committee.¹

This move had no effect on the attitude of the Central Board of Finance. It accepted that the Society would continue its efforts to bring about a closer relationship with the colleges, but made no secret of its hope that in view of the Board's large stake in their well-being, for almost 30% of the Assembly's income was spent on the training colleges, great care would be taken not to transfer responsibility from the Board of Supervision to the Central Council, 'until internal reorganisation of that body had reached a stage which will give confidence to the colleges themselves and to the Central Board of Finance'.²

1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 17, 29.9.1942, p. 1. The most important recommendation of this Committee, of a further revision of the constitution of the Standing Committee in line with the recommendation of the Commission of 1929, which had suggested only 10 National Society subscribers in a total membership of 78, was not acted upon. It was the Committee's view that such a revision to allow for the widest possible representation of educational interests in the Church was essential if the Society were to be accepted at large as the Central Council of the Church for Religious Education. See National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 16, 10.7.1941, p. 187.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 6, 2.7.1942, p. 81.

The Society's efforts to bring the colleges within its orbit would receive no encouragement from that quarter.

In 1942, however, the Society's influence was further diminished, when Canon Cockin became the temporary Secretary of the Board of Supervision and, for the first time since its inception, its Secretary did not hold similar responsibilities with the National Society. He had in fact been persuaded to take on the work because the alternative would have been to appoint Canon Woodard of Ely, Vice-Chairman of the Standing Committee of the Society but not a member of the Board of Supervision. To have made that appointment at a time when the question of the relations between the colleges and the Society was, in the Bishop of Peterborough's words, 'a very difficult and tricky business', would have seemed 'to hand them over bodily to the National Society'.¹

The tussle continued into 1943, when Sir Walter Moberley, Chairman of the Board of Supervision and of the Society's Education Committee but an outspoken critic of the composition of the Standing Committee with its roughly 50% element of National Society subscribers, left the Society in no doubt that the colleges would not be responsible to a central body on which they were not represented.² Sir Walter, Chairman of the University Grants

1 Board of Supervision, Secretary's Correspondence: letter to Cockin, 22.6.1942.

2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 17, 6.4.1943, p. 79.

Committee, was giving the effective lead thought by Cockin and Grey to be lacking when they had engineered the resignation of the Bishop of Peterborough from the Chairmanship of the Board of Supervision in 1942.¹ The Dean of St. Albans, however, returned to the matter and took the issue to the Assembly, arguing in vain that connection with the Board of Supervision and the colleges should be regarded as an essential part of the operations of a Central Council.²

The Society then made a bid for limited control, in asking that the 'spiritual oversight and training for religious education' of the students in the colleges should be entrusted to them.³ The Board of Supervision dismissed the bid, giving as a reason that they were unwilling to raise the matter with colleges at a time when they were engrossed in questions about the reorganisation which would follow the publication of the McNair Report. It was of course a voice in that reorganisation which the Society was seeking. To add what must have seemed insult to injury, the Board expressed appreciation of the Society's interest in the work of the colleges and its own intention of keeping the Society fully informed of the Board's policy and programme.⁴

-
- 1 Board of Supervision, Secretary's Correspondence: letter from Cockin to Moberley, 14.8.1942. Grey had 'seen William (Temple) and told him to get rid of Peterborough'.
 - 2 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, 1943, p. 215.
 - 3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 17, 27.10.1943, p. 117.
 - 4 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 6, 2.3.1944, p. 143.

The Society realised that it was on a losing wicket and, following a discussion of the relation of the Teacher Training section and the Board of Supervision, and recognising that there was little the section could do, it was agreed that it should be amalgamated with the Voluntary Religious Education section, concerned particularly with the provision of leaders and teachers in voluntary work.¹ A final attempt was made by the Society towards the end of 1944, when it tried to meet objections to the extension of its influence, by acknowledging the necessity of the continuing role and interest of the Central Board of Finance in relation to the colleges, just as the dioceses had a continuing financial role in relation to the schools. It was urged, however, that colleges and schools 'should form one whole and closely related unity', and that under the Society, as the Central Council of the Church, they would not be seen as competing causes.²

It was the last unsuccessful attempt to make what the Society considered a just claim to 'a greater share than is at present allotted to it in this key work of the Church', before the Society itself ceased to be the Central Council.³ It had found itself in a situation where it could not fulfil that function. The Assembly was unable to provide sufficient funds for the extension of the Society's work. The Society received no Assembly funds until 1938,

1 National Society: Annual Report, 1944, p. 4.

2 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 17, 25.10.1944, p. 211.

3 National Society: Annual Report, 1945, p. 13.

when £2,500 was allocated, and the grant had no more than doubled by 1944.¹ In addition, its claim to leadership was unacknowledged by other bodies concerned with religious education, not only the Board of Supervision. Its central role had been denied by the setting up, in 1942, of the Church of England Youth Council, which presented its own budget to the Assembly and had no responsibility to the Society.

In 1945, at the request of the Society, the Archbishop of Canterbury appointed a Commission under Lord Selborne to consider its functions and constitution. Its report echoed the view of the Committee of Six that the unrepresentative character of the Standing Committee unfitted it as the Central Council, and the Commission recommended the setting up of a new Central Council for Education, directly responsible to the Church Assembly, on which the National Society would be represented, but along with other educational agencies of the Church.²

The Assembly, in accepting the Report, in effect accepted the blame laid at its door by the Commission for having vested the National Society with the functions of the Central Council while refusing to endorse the complementary radical changes in its constitution which the 1929 Commission had proposed. It had designed a piece of machinery which had not, and never could have

1 The total Assembly budget in this period was no more than £145,000 per annum and only 5,000 of the 14,000 parishes were subscribers to National Society funds.

2 Church Assembly: C.A. 812 The Church and Education 1946, p. 14.

worked in the circumstances in which it was compelled to operate.¹

The Archbishop assured the Society, however, that the setting up of the new Council would mean no diminution in the importance of the Society, but would instead bring 'freedom from extraneous complications' which would strengthen it.²

The Board of Supervision had withstood the advance of the Society and in so doing had illustrated the weakness of the Society's position as the Central Council, but it did not itself escape a demand for reform, which began with the return of the colleges to the question of direct representation, for they had been only partially satisfied by the increased representation in the 1938 reconstitution of the Board. The Principal of Exeter renewed the demand for individual college representation in 1941, but the Board, with other problems to deal with in the emergency, decided to take no action.³

In 1942, however, Mr. Hussey left the service of the National Society and the Board of Supervision to return to work abroad, initially for a period of two years, as an adviser on education to the Ethiopian government. He had been overshadowed by his predecessor and had not been sufficiently long in office to have made his personal mark. In accepting the Board of Supervision post

1 Church Assembly: C.A. 812 The Church and Education 1946, p. 9.

2 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XXVII, No. 2, 1947, p. 266.

3 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 6, 6.11.1941, p. 9.

temporarily, Canon Cockin said that he wanted to see a different type of Secretaryship, in which policy, personal relationships and the religious life of the colleges featured much more largely than pure administration.¹ As Moderator since 1938, he had won the confidence of the colleges and clearly had the measure of personal influence which had been exercised by Mr. Holland, but exercised it as much in the pastoral as in the administrative concern. He was less concerned with past quarrels between the colleges and the Board than with ensuring good relations between them in the future, and with providing that intelligent sympathy which many colleges had felt to be lacking in the Board of Supervision.

He was, of course, helped by the setting up of the McNair Committee in 1942 by Mr. R.A. Butler. With reform in prospect it was imperative that there should be a close look at the educational machinery concerned with teacher-training. The Council of Principals of Church of England Colleges had, understandably, not met between May 1939 and October 1942, and the General Council had not met since March 1938. Canon Cockin responded sympathetically, therefore, to a request from the Principals in October 1942 that a meeting of the General Council should be called.²

1 Board of Supervision, Secretary's Correspondence: letter to Bishop of Peterborough, 25.6.1942.

2 Council of Principals of Church of England Colleges: Minutes, 16.10.1942.

The promised meeting did not, however, take place until June 1943, and then with a wider composition, and it is evident that Cockin wished to prepare the ground well before such a meeting because he wanted it to concern itself not with the immediate but with the future, with the need to provide for an increased number of teachers after the war and with the part that the Church as a whole ought to play in assisting its colleges in their longer-term development.¹ The work of the sub-committee of the Board of Supervision preparing evidence for submission to the McNair Committee formed the background to the meeting, and the sub-committee had made known its views that steps should be taken to ensure closer and more regular consultation between the Board and the colleges, and that the name of the Board should be changed, because 'the implications of the word Supervision are not altogether happy'.²

The meeting, over two days in June 1943, was of the Board of Supervision, Principals and representatives of Governing Bodies, with the Archbishop of Canterbury in the chair. The discussion was firmly centred on the question raised in different forms by the Bishop of Liverpool and the Archbishop, as to who was to be responsible for shaping a Church policy and putting it

1 Council of Principals: Minutes, 5.5.1943.

2 Board of Supervision (1943) The Church Training Colleges: Supplementary Evidence submitted to Board of Supervision by Sub-Committee appointed to prepare evidence for McNair Committee.

into effect to meet post-war opportunities.¹ The fact that the question was posed is significant, for it shows that there was no clear recognition at that time of where the onus of responsibility should lie, and the impression conveyed by the Minutes of the meeting is of a confused discussion of the question.

The question led inevitably to a discussion on the relationship of the colleges to a central authority and how to secure proper representation of their points of view. The outcome was that the Board was instructed to set up a sub-committee to make suggestions for a reorganisation of the central bodies. There had to be a resolution of the problem of how to balance local autonomy with central responsibility. What was needed, in the Board's view, was a central authority which would foster a stronger sense of unity among the colleges while enabling them to maintain a proper degree of autonomy.²

The report of the sub-committee acknowledged that there was ground for the feeling that adequate opportunity had not been provided for the representation of college views, since the General Council had not met for five years, and in stressing the necessity of having a policy-making body which possessed the respect and confidence of those for whom it spoke, it accepted in an oblique way that the Board of Supervision at that time did

1 General Council of Church Training Colleges: Minutes of Conference, 24-25.6.1943.

2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 6, 1.7.1943, p. 128.

not have that respect. Representation was clearly the central issue, but in the scheme of reorganisation proposed little was, on the surface, changed but the names of the central bodies.

It was recommended that the General Council should become the Standing Conference of Church Training Colleges, with membership of three representatives from each college as before, one of whom, however, had to be the Principal of the college. It would meet once a year for two days, but unlike the General Council, whose agenda had been drawn up by the Board of Supervision, it would have control of its own agenda. The sharing of Chairman and Secretary with the Board would continue. The Standing Conference would have the right to send proposals and resolutions to the policy-making body for its consideration.

The Board of Supervision was to become the Council of Church Training Colleges. The policy-making function and representation remained as before, with an additional member from the National Society, a sop no doubt to its pretensions, and the appointment of Canon Cockin as the full-time Secretary of the Council was recommended. Explaining why it had not produced a more radical plan, the committee asserted that the 1938 revision of the Board's constitution had provided for representation of the best educational and administrative experience to be found in the Church, and a more effective representation of college views than had been possible before, and that it ought to be given a fairer trial than the war years had afforded. It was stressed that special attention should be

called to the responsibilities of Governing Body representatives to ensure effective communication with colleges in the electoral group.¹

The Archbishops approved the recommendations, but the explanation of the lack of radicalism was not acceptable to the Principals. The change of name left unclear to what extent colleges not individually represented on the Council could gain access to its proceedings, and at the first meeting of the Standing Conference in October 1944 a formal request was received from their Council asking for that individual representation. It was, predictably, refused on the same ground as earlier requests had been refused, namely that an increase of membership would have produced an unwieldy body.²

Cockin had come to the conclusion after the June 1943 conference that the colleges' lack of confidence in the Board of Supervision at that time was primarily due to the fact that there was no one wholly concerned with their affairs. Hussey clearly had not had Holland's grasp of affairs and had been finding his feet in the multiplicity of duties of the National Society Secretary. Cockin in 1943 was only a part-time officer of the Board. In accepting the full-time secretaryship of the Council in 1944, and resigning his canonry at St. Paul's, he

1 Council of the Church Training Colleges: Report of Sub-Committee, appointed 1.7.1943, submitted 4.11.1943.

2 Standing Conference of the Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 4-5.10.1944, p. 2.

saw 'the possibility of turning a rather unsatisfactory situation into a really valuable piece of work'.¹ The Council of the Church Training Colleges met for the first time in October 1944, under Sir Walter Moberley, and in 1948 took its place alongside the Schools', Children's, Youth and Adult Councils, together with the National Society, which claimed to have nourished and brought them all up², on the new Church of England Council for Education.

Seaman regrets that 'no body existed in 1945 comparable to the Roman Catholic Council of Education, with authority to undertake strategic planning for the Church Colleges as a whole'.³ The Board of Supervision had not had that authority, but had followed policies which had been thought to trespass against the autonomy of individual colleges, and hence the tension between the central and the local, which is characteristic of Church of England institutions. There is the recognition of the need of a central organisation as long as it impinges with only minimal effect on independent action. Nevertheless, Mr. Butler expressed the hope that in the Council the colleges 'would find a medium through which they could combine to survey the field as one', and plan a policy for the future of the colleges as a whole'.⁴

-
- 1 Board of Supervision, Secretary's Correspondence: letter to Archbishop of Canterbury, 23.10.1943.
 - 2 National Society: Annual Report, 1947, p. 12.
 - 3 R.D.H. Seaman (1978) St. Peter's, Saltley, 1944-1978, p. 14.
 - 4 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 7, 8.3.1945, p. 7.

The changes which came about in 1944 were in response to the tension and, though slight, were not cosmetic. The change of name of the policy-making body was psychologically of enormous significance. The threat of direction implied in the word Supervision was replaced by the promise of co-operation in what was hoped would be seen as a new approach to the task. The policy of Concentration and the constant intervention in the affairs of the colleges associated with the Board of Supervision were placed firmly in the past. The appointment of Canon Cockin ensured a different atmosphere in the relationship between the colleges and the centre, for since his appointment as Moderator he had shown that the material needs, the concern for buildings and finance, which had of necessity for so long dominated the colleges' thinking were not the only needs. If Holland may be said to have been primarily concerned for the form of a Church presence in teacher-training, Cockin may be described as concerned primarily for its substance. By means of conferences, retreats and consultation with Principals during an enquiry into religious teaching he had undertaken in 1943, he had opened up discussion of deeper spiritual and educational needs and of the whole affective aspect of college life.

If we share Seaman's regret that the machinery provided in 1944 served to ensure only that 'the Church advanced on a wide front, with no strategic plan or control'¹, then it must be regretted that that is the way the Church of England works.

1 R.D.H. Seaman (1978) St. Peter's, Saltley, 1944-1978, p. 14.

CHAPTER 3

A ROLE FOR THE FUTURE

The confidence in Britain's future which led in 1941 to the issuing of the Board of Education's provisional scheme for educational reform, the Green Book, led also, in 1942, to the setting up of a Committee under Sir Arnold McNair to consider the supply, recruitment and training of teachers, the arrangements for which it was to describe as 'chaotic and ill-adjusted even to present needs'.¹ As discussions proceeded it was borne in upon the Church authorities that there was no wish in official quarters to eliminate the contribution of the Church colleges, but that in the national system to be recommended the assumption was that the Local Education Authorities would assume much greater responsibility for the training of teachers.²

Canon Cockin welcomed the setting up of the Committee, as affording the opportunity for the Board of Supervision to rethink the whole contribution of the Church to teacher-training and as 'confronting it with the imperative necessity of doing so'.³ The Roman Catholic and Methodist authorities recognised no such imperative, and for the same reason. The Catholic college

-
- 1 Board of Education (1944) Teachers and Youth Leaders, p. 18.
 - 2 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 6, 2.3.1944, p. 147. At the outbreak of war there were still only 21 Two Year L.E.A. colleges as compared with 50 Voluntary colleges.
 - 3 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 6, 27.8.1942, p. 90.

is 'by its nature an institution subsidiary and complementary to the Church'.¹ The colleges owed their existence to the initiative of the Church and their primary purpose was quite clear, the training of Catholic teachers to serve in Catholic schools, a purpose served by an admission examination in religion, and instruction in Doctrine and Scripture which, at the time of a survey conducted by H.M.I. Miss Monkhouse in 1933, was examined at the end of each of five terms.²

The Roman Catholic Church made no claim to have concern beyond its purely domestic one, the education of Catholic children, and in all discussions of educational reform, on the fundamental point of having Catholic teachers for its children, 'the Church was absolutely rigid'.³ Thus in 1944 the Catholic Education Council set up a committee to consider the provision of further training facilities in view of the opportunities presented by the Butler Act and the McNair Report, and its deliberations bore fruit in the proposal to transfer St. Charles' from North Kensington to larger premises at Roehampton, where it became known as Digby Stuart College, and to provide two new colleges for women.⁴ The opportunity was to be seized and the new colleges would have been

-
- 1 D.A. Carrigan (1961) The Catholic Teachers' Colleges in the United Kingdom, 1850-1960, p. 6.
 - 2 ED 24/1935 Papers on Religious Instruction in Training Colleges. Public Record Office.
 - 3 M. Cruickshank (1963) Church and State in English Education, p. 143.
 - 4 Catholic Education Council: Report, 1945, p. 12.

expected to share that 'high ideal of training students for the apostolic work of Catholic teachers' as agents of the Church, enunciated by the Principal of Strawberry Hill in 1929.¹ It was a clearly defined rationale expressive of institutions run by those who themselves had a high sense of vocation.

The Methodist response to the setting up of the McNair Committee and the discussion of reform was also a restatement of their fundamental position. They accepted, but regretted, that education was organised within a denominational framework, believing 'that the great simplicities of the Christian religion should form the basis of English education'.² They had joined with Anglicans and other Free Church leaders in 1941 in launching a public appeal for the firmer recognition of religion in schools, and were to see their joint recommendations integrated into the general scheme of reform outlined in the White Paper, Educational Reconstruction, in 1943. Religious Instruction was to have a statutory place in the curriculum of every school, and the subject was to be included in the Teachers' Certificate examination.³ In their evidence to the McNair Committee the Principals of Westminster and Southlands stressed that it would be mainly through colleges such as theirs that a supply of teachers, themselves Christians, able, willing and competent to give religious instruction, could

1 J. Doyle (1929) 'The Catholic Colleges', in The Tablet, Vol. CLIV, 1929, p. 449.

2 Methodist Education Committee: Report, 1943-44, p. 11.

3 Board of Education (1943) Educational Reconstruction, pp. 11-12.

be secured for the schools. 'We would emphasise that we do get students with the right kind of background', that is from the best type of Methodist homes in terms of spiritual environment.¹ Hence the colleges also had a domestic purpose, 'to confirm and inform the religious attitude to life of their members during their stay in college'.²

The Methodist Principals were to see their recommendation of a longer training course, on the need for which there was widespread agreement, accepted by McNair. The acceptance of their recommendation, on which there was also widespread agreement, that students should not be committed to teaching until all parties were in a position to form an opinion on their fitness and likelihood of success, was to lead to a significant change at Westminster. The abolition of the Pledge provided the opportunity for a return, effected in 1946, to the provision of a two-year course. The four-year course at Westminster had not been without its disadvantages. The Principal was aware that it had led to an unduly academic outlook on the work in schools, that in the pursuit of a degree students of mediocre talent had been overstressed, and that lack of time had not allowed the college freedom to experiment in training. But perhaps most important, many Methodist young men not capable of taking a degree had been excluded from training in a Methodist environment and this in the

1 Methodist Education Committee: Report, 1942-43, p. 21.

2 Ibid.

Principal's view was to be regretted.¹ The Principal's plea, accepted by the Governors, was for a 'new Westminster that will play a leading part in the educational world of tomorrow'.²

The Roman Catholics and Methodists had restated their position. Canon Cockin had spoken of rethinking the Church of England's contribution to teacher training, and we have to see his hand in the evidence submitted to the McNair Committee by the Board of Supervision. What that rethinking might mean he had indicated in suggesting the main principle which ought to govern the preparation of the Board's evidence. His advice was that they should avoid giving the impression that they were only interested in Church colleges or even in the religious aspects of teacher-training, and should stress the contribution which the colleges had made, and could continue to make to the supply of teachers for the schools of the nation.³ Here was a move away from denominationalism, from the emphasis on the maintenance of Anglican influence, and here Canon Cockin exposed the tension which had existed in the Church of England, certainly since 1907, and probably before that, about the purpose of its training colleges.

-
- 1 F.C. Pritchard (1951) The Story of Westminster College, 1851-1951, p. 197.
 - 2 Methodist Education Committee: Report, 1944-45, p. 25.
 - 3 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 6, 28.7.1942, p. 84.

The strident denominationalism of the National Society in the crisis over the 1907 Regulations and the admission of Non-conformists had been tempered by the realism of the Principals, especially those of the men's colleges, about the actual nature and extent of Anglican influence in the colleges at that time. The tension was apparent, however, whenever the colleges were discussed in the Church Assembly in the crises of the 1930s. On the one hand there was the expression of concern that the Church should get value for money in terms of the colleges turning out first-class Church people who would teach their churchmanship wherever possible¹, and the unsuccessful attempt in 1931 to limit loans only to colleges which could be described as 'loyal to the statutory principles of the Church of England'.² One of the most outspoken critics was the Bishop of Bradford, whose unofficial investigation, to which the Committee of Enquiry had advised colleges to make no response, led him to the conclusion that the doctrinal teaching in the colleges was vague and unsatisfactory, and that the absence of priests in the colleges for women left no one 'pledged to the guardianship of Church of England doctrine and practice'.³

-
- 1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XIV, No. 2, 1933, p. 271.
 - 2 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XII, No. 1, 1931, p. 102.
 - 3 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XV, No. 1, 1934, p. 151.

On the other hand there was awareness expressed by the Bishop of Durham that the battle was for Christian, not denominational influence to prevail¹, and sympathy for the Principals' view that it was not fair to throw on the training colleges the blame for ignorance of the Faith, which belonged to the schools, and that it was imposing an impossible task on them to secure in the time available, 'that all was permeated by the Christian spirit and the doctrine of the Church'.² The plea was also made that the training colleges should not be judged by the standards of the theological colleges, which candidates entered with a definite commitment.³

We are made aware of differences between individual colleges in the degree of emphasis they placed on their Anglican character, in the Reports of Interviews of the Committee of Enquiry and in those of the Visitors to colleges in the 1930s. The former noted the 'definite religious life' at Whitelands, which was 'all that could be desired', and the influence of the Cathedral on the life of the college which made Salisbury 'of a type very desirable to preserve'. St. Gabriel's and Fishponds, with their noticeable Church atmosphere, were others of the same type and 'a great asset'

1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XI, No. 3, 1930, p. 517.

2 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XVIII, No. 2, 1937, p. 377.

3 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XV, No. 1, 1934, p. 117.

to the group, and the Church teaching at Bede was 'entirely satisfactory'. The emphasis at Derby and Truro was muted, for both colleges were used as 'the headquarters of much of the educational life of the neighbourhood', and it was for the part they played locally and for the vigour of their education work that they were at the time thought worth preserving.¹

The college Visitors in 1935-1937 found a noticeable Church atmosphere lacking in a number of colleges. At St. Hild's there was no specific teaching on the Prayer Book, the Catechism or Church Doctrine, and it was thought that there was too little teaching on Doctrine at Peterborough. It was also noted that at Bangor there were few celebrations of Holy Communion, and no teaching on Church History, and Brighton, it was suggested, 'might give more time to the institutional aspect of Christianity'.²

The tension manifested itself in the request from Whitelands in 1943 to the National Society, for a change in the rule confining membership of the College Council to communicant members of the Church of England, a request initially refused on the ground that dilution of Church influence would be the result of such a change.³ The unsuccessful attempt by the Bishop of Sheffield in 1943, after the appointment of a scientist to the

1 Committee of Enquiry 1933, Minutes and Reports of Interviews: Reports attached to pp. 141-161.

2 Board of Supervision, Reports on Training College Visitations 1935-37: Abstract.

3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 17, 21.1.1943, p. 30.

principalship of St. Gabriel's, to get the Board of Supervision to express its concern that in the appointment of Principals consideration should be given to the ability to take a share in the appropriate religious teaching, is another illustration of that tension.¹

The evidence submitted to the McNair Committee by the Board of Supervision took the form of a statement drawn up by a sub-committee. It followed Cockin's advice, and acknowledged at the outset that it saw the colleges, not in narrow denominational terms but as making a contribution to Christian education and to the greater efficiency of the system of training as a whole. The tension was, however, acknowledged in the frankness with which the committee dealt with the staffing and government of the colleges, to make the point that the sectarian spirit was not as strong as might be supposed. Some colleges had been willing to appoint non-Anglican staff and some wanted to encourage inter-denominational co-operation, but changes, it was admitted, were needed in the personnel of Governing Bodies because in some colleges policy had been too much directed 'by what may not unfairly be described as old-fashioned religious paternalism rather than by an enlightened grasp of the principles of Christian education'.²

1 Board of Supervision: Minutes, Book 6, 26.2.1943, p. 97.

2 Board of Supervision (1943) The Church Training Colleges: Evidence submitted on behalf of the Board of Supervision to the Board of Education Committee on Teacher Training.

It is in the supplementary evidence presented to the Board of Supervision by the sub-committee that we find the clearest realisation of the tension. Here we see the hand of Cockin again, for it contains the substance of a Memorandum drawn up by him in 1943 after his own enquiry into religious teaching in the colleges. He recognised that it had to be accepted by the Church at large that the religious climate had radically altered in the lifetime of the colleges, and that that change had had its effect on the students entering the Anglican colleges. Thus not all candidates were Church of England members, and a comparatively small number had been well instructed in any religious sense. Some would hesitate to describe themselves as Christians, some would have a bias against the particular Anglican religious influence which they expected to find there, and some might be actively hostile to any religious influences at all.¹

The function of a Church college in those changed circumstances was seen as three-fold, and expressed in a Council of Church Training Colleges pamphlet in 1945, which it is a reasonable assumption to make was the work of Cockin as Secretary. Thus a college was to deepen and train the religious life of its professing Anglican students, make provision for the religious life of students

1 Board of Supervision (1943) The Church Training Colleges: Supplementary Evidence submitted to the Board of Supervision by Sub-Committee appointed to prepare evidence for McNair Committee.

of other denominations and exercise a missionary ministry towards those who professed no faith.¹

The issue was no longer Anglicanism versus Nonconformity, but one of what Cockin later described as 'a life and death struggle for the maintenance, maybe the salvaging, of an education which deserves to be called Christian',² a struggle in which it was thought that the habit of thinking in denominational terms could be one of the greatest obstacles to achieving an effectively Christian education. Thus there was to be neither exclusive denominationalism, nor interdenominationalism, for the Anglican faith and practice in the colleges was not to be interfered with, but Christian co-operation in extending Christian influence in the fulfilment of a responsibility to contribute to the training of teachers for all the nation's children. This national responsibility was clearly enunciated by Cockin in his comment on the ending in 1944 of the Archbishops' General Examination in Religious Knowledge for those entering college. He described the examination as a relic of the past, of the time when the colleges 'were primarily an appendage of the Church rather than a factor in the whole educational system'.³

-
- 1 Council of Church Training Colleges (1945) The Key to Christian Education: The Opportunity of the Church Training Colleges, p. 8.
 - 2 Church Assembly: C.A. 931 The Development of the Church Training Colleges, 1949, A Report by the Council of the Church Training Colleges, p. 9.
 - 3 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 17, 3.10.1944, p. 198.

It was enunciated also in the ending, in 1948, after much discussion and consultation with colleges and the National Society, of the Archbishops' Certificate examination. It was replaced by a voluntary, Religious Teaching Certificate, indicating a student's competence to give instruction in Religious Knowledge. The policy, Cockin declared, was 'not to cling to little bits of Church machinery, but to strengthen the whole programme in schools'.¹

The course for the future was charted. The Church was to be a partner of the State in the provision of teachers, but the tension remained. At the first meeting of the Standing Conference in 1944, where the more conservative views of Governing Bodies were likely to be expressed, there was a strong appeal from some representatives for the colleges to be more effective instruments of the Church, and for the repeal of the Regulation making up to 50% of places available to non-Anglicans. Other representatives thought, however, that this would deprive the colleges of opportunities for evangelism.² The tension has been an element in the thinking about the colleges ever since, though it may well be argued that since 1944 the distinctiveness of the Church of England colleges became progressively more difficult to see.

1 National Society Standing Committee: Minutes, No. 17, 3.10.1944, p. 198.

2 Standing Conference of the Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 4-5.10.1944, p. 4.

The McNair Report was published in May 1944, and has been described as 'one of the seminal documents in English educational history',¹ for its recommendations which were to lead in the shorter or longer term to the recognition of one grade of teacher, a single basic salary scale, the abolition of the Pledge, the three-year course, and closer co-operation between colleges and universities in a framework for teacher-training which was to last until recent years. The Report's criticism of the then existing facilities for training, and its diagnosis of the root causes of their deficiencies and defects, were to produce in the course of time an unprecedented improvement in college buildings, equipment and amenities, but in 1944 the Church of England was faced with three alternatives.

It could contract out of teacher training for good, which was unthinkable. It could follow a policy of Concentration, but the bitterness of the events of the 1930s did not encourage the repetition of such an exercise, or it could follow the course charted by Cockin and make an all-out attempt to put its colleges in a condition in which they might maintain their position in the national system, and make a contribution to Christian education. At the first meeting of the Standing Conference in October 1944, the challenge was taken up, and it was generally agreed not only that the colleges should be put in order but also that there should be considerable expansion.²

1 H.C. Dent (1976) 'Unprecedented Expansion: Post-War Trends in Teacher Education', in Canterbury Chapters, ed. M. Berry and J. Higginson, p. 35.

2 Standing Conference of Church Training Colleges: Minutes, 4-5.10.1944, p. 4.

Such resolution, however, constituted a major challenge to the Church in the matter of finance, for Governing Bodies did not have the resources required. Cockin, at a later date describing what next took place, said that the extent of the commitment needed was investigated by a strong committee, representative of the interests of the colleges and, perhaps surprisingly, of the National Society. Its proposals were submitted to Archbishop Temple at a weekend conference at Canterbury, and it was finally decided that 'in the interests of the Church an attempt should be made to save the colleges'.¹

It was a decision no doubt encouraged by the action of the Ministry of Education in 1945 to help colleges remove the stigma of the 'trail of cheapness', and to lighten the heavy burden of bringing them up to standard. The Voluntary college authorities had been bringing concerted pressure to bear to this end since early in 1944, and the Ministry agreed to make available grants of up to 50% of capital expenditure on extending, rebuilding or equipping existing accommodation.²

The decision to 'save the colleges' was endorsed by the Church Assembly in 1946, debating a motion in Cockin's name, 'that the Assembly accepts in principle the responsibility of

1 Church Assembly: C.A. 931 The Development of the Church Training Colleges, 1949, A Report by the Council of Church Training Colleges, p. 6.

2 National Society: Annual Report, 1945, p. 20.

the Church for securing the future of the Training Colleges'.¹
It was a long-term commitment to expansion. A new phase in the life of the colleges had begun, and the hope was that commitment in the name of the Church at large and the commitment of the central Council to that enlightened and vigorous encouragement which the colleges felt that they deserved, would encourage the individualist temper to give way to a federation of colleges which belonged, and knew that they belonged, to the Church.

1 Church Assembly: Report of Proceedings, Vol. XXVI, No. 2, 1946, p. 178.

POSTSCRIPT

The Voluntary monopoly of teacher-training was broken in 1890 but in 1944 the Voluntary sector was still a factor of significance. Its share of the total number of teachers in training just before the Second World War was just under 39%, and of those in training in Two-Year colleges, 9,128, the proportion in Voluntary colleges was 60%.

The undenominational colleges in 1938 had 1,089 students, or just under 12% of the total in the Two-Year colleges. The Roman Catholic Church, with eight colleges instead of three in 1890, and 865 students, had more than 9%. The Methodists remained with two colleges, but with their share of places reduced from just over 7% in 1890 to less than 3%. The Church of England, with 3,261 students in Two-Year colleges accounted for just below 36% of the total.¹

In 1890 there were thirteen Anglican colleges for men and seventeen for women. The average size was 79 for men, with seven colleges below that figure, and 69 for women, with eleven colleges below average.² By 1944 the number of colleges had decreased to ten for men and fifteen for women, and the numbers of students for which they were approved were 1,412 men and 2,168 women. The numbers for which the colleges had accommodation, however, as a result of Concentration and expansion, were 1,730 men and 2,273 women, an average of 173 and 152 respectively.

1 Board of Education: Education in 1938, p. 192.

2 The Official Year Book of the Church of England 1890, p. 171.

Six of the colleges for women had accommodation for well below the average number, but among the men's colleges only Culham and Bede were substantially below the average. Six of the women's colleges had ten or more places over and above the number for which they were recognised, while Carmarthen, Cheltenham, Chester and York among the men's colleges had accommodation considerably in excess of their approved numbers and so were well placed to take additional students after the war.¹

The denominational colleges in 1944 still held a position in the field of teacher-training which the Government could not afford to ignore, in its plans for the expansion of provision and for restructuring of the system in the wake of the McNair Report.

1 Board of Supervision (1943) The Church Training Colleges: Supplementary evidence submitted to the Board of Supervision by the sub-committee appointed to prepare evidence for the McNair Committee.

APPENDIX

THE CHURCH COLLEGES

<u>College</u>	<u>Foundation</u>	<u>1981</u>
<u>ANGLICAN</u>		
<u>Men</u>		
BATTERSEA St. John	1840	See Chelsea, St. Mark and St. John
CARMARTHEN Trinity	1848	Trinity College, Carmarthen
CHELSEA St. Mark and St. John, amalgamation of the Colleges of St. John, Battersea (1840) and St. Mark, Chelsea (1841)	1923	Moved to Plymouth, 1973
CHELTENHAM St. Paul	1847	1977 one of six colleges in Glouc- estershire Institute of Higher Education
CHESTER	1839	Chester College
CULHAM	1853	Students last admitted 1976
DURHAM College of the Venerable Bede	1839	Merged with St. Hild's 1975, admitted last students 1978. Residential college of University of Durham, 1979
EXETER St. Luke	1840	1978 part of University of Exeter School of Education
SALTLEY St. Peter	1850	Students last admitted 1977
WINCHESTER King Alfred	1839	King Alfred's College of Higher Education
YORK St. John	1841	1975 amalgamated with Ripon to form Ripon and York St. John College of Higher Education

Women

BANGOR St. Mary formerly CAERNARVON, for men	1846	Students last admitted 1976
BISHOP'S STORTFORD Hockerill	1852	Students last admitted 1975
BRIGHTON	1842	Closed 1938
BRISTOL Fishponds, St. Matthias	1853	1976 part of Bristol Polytechnic Faculty of Education
CHELTENHAM St. Mary	1847	1977 one of six colleges in Gloucestershire Institute of Higher Education
CHICHESTER Bishop Otter	1840	1977 part of West Sussex Institute of Higher Education with Bognor Regis College of Education
DERBY Bishop Lonsdale	1851	1977 Derby Lonsdale College of Higher Education, with Derby College of Art and Technology
DURHAM St. Hild	1858	1975 amalgamated with Bede, admitted last students 1978. Residential college of University of Durham, 1979
HOME AND COLONIAL	1836	Closed 1929
KENNINGTON St. Gabriel	1899	1976 amalgamated with Goldsmiths' College and Rachel Macmillan College
LINCOLN Bishop Grosseteste	1862	Bishop Grosseteste College

LIVERPOOL St. Katharine formerly WARRINGTON	1844	1977 part of Liverpool Institute of Higher Education with Notre Dame College
NORWICH	1839	1981 became School of Education in University of East Anglia
OXFORD Felstead House	1872	Closed 1912
PETERBOROUGH St. Peter	1859	Closed 1938
RIPON	1846	1975 amalgamated with York to form Ripon and York St. John College of Higher Education
SALISBURY Sarum St. Michael	1841	Students last admitted 1975
TOTTENHAM St. Katharine	1878	1964 became ALL SAINTS, with Berridge House, Hampstead. 1978 part of Middlesex Polytechnic
TRURO	1849	Closed 1938
WHITELANDS	1841	1975 part of Roehampton Institute of Higher Education with Digby Stuart, Froebel and Southlands

ROMAN CATHOLIC

Men

STRAWBERRY HILL St. Mary formerly HAMMERSMITH	1850	London, St. Mary's College
---	------	-------------------------------

Women

BIRMINGHAM Selly Park	1910	1946 moved near Rugby, became St. Paul's, Newbold Revel. Students last admitted 1975
--------------------------	------	--

KENSINGTON St. Charles formerly WANDSWORTH	1874	1946 moved to Roehampton and became Digby Stuart College 1975 part of Roehampton Institute of Higher Education, with Whitelands, Froebel and Southlands
KINGSTON UPON HULL Endsleigh	1905	1976 part of Hull College of Higher Education with Kingston upon Hull Training College
LIVERPOOL Mount Pleasant, Notre Dame	1856	1977 part of Liverpool Institute of Higher Education with St. Katharine's
NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE Fenham, St. Mary	1905	St. Mary's College, in association with Newcastle upon Tyne Polytechnic
PRESTWICH Sedgley Park, formerly SALFORD	1903	Students last admitted 1976
SOUTHAMPTON La Sainte Union	1904	La Sainte Union College of Higher Education

METHODIST

Men

WESTMINSTER	1851	1959 moved to Oxford, Westminster College
-------------	------	---

Women

SOUTHLANDS	1872	1975 part of Roehampton Institute of Higher Education with Digby Stuart, Froebel and Whitelands
------------	------	---

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

1. Unpublished Material

A. Church House, Westminster

Minutes of the Board of Supervision, 1916-1944

Minutes of the Council of the Church Training Colleges,
1944-1953

Minutes of the General Council of the Church Training
Colleges, 1908-1938, 1943-1944

Minutes of the Standing Conference of the Church Training
Colleges, 1944-1960

Minutes of the Council of Principals of the Church of
England Training Colleges, 1892-1943

Board of Supervision: Committee of Enquiry 1933: Minutes
and Reports of Interviews with college representatives

Board of Supervision, Correspondence with Board of Education,
1919-1942

Board of Supervision, Reports on Training College Visitations,
1935-1937

Board of Supervision, General Correspondence

Board of Supervision, Correspondence on National Emergency
and Concentration of Colleges, 1940-1942

Board of Supervision, Secretary's Correspondence, 1938-1946

B. The National Society

Minutes of the General Committee of the National Society,
1854-1881

Minutes of the National Society Standing Committee, 1882-
1945

Minute Book of the National Society Consultative Committee
Correspondence, 1886-1914

Miscellaneous Correspondence, 1909-1915

Training Colleges Correspondence

Bede Correspondence

Brighton Correspondence

Carmarthen Correspondence

Cheltenham Correspondence

Chichester Correspondence

Culham Correspondence

Derby Correspondence

Hockerill Correspondence

Home and Colonial Correspondence

Liverpool, St. Katharine's Correspondence

Norwich Correspondence

Oxford, Felstead House Correspondence

Peterborough Correspondence

Ripon Correspondence

St. Gabriel's Correspondence

St. Hild's Correspondence

St. John's Battersea Correspondence

St. Mark's Chelsea Correspondence

Whitelands Correspondence

Winchester Correspondence

York Correspondence

C. Public Record Office

CAB 37/83 1906 The question of the continuance of state grants to denominational training colleges and secondary schools. Memorandum by Mr. Birrell.

- CAB 37/ 88 1907 The denominational difficulty in secondary schools and colleges. R. McKenna.
- CAB 37/101 1909 Regulations of the Board of Education for secondary schools and for the training of teachers, and the objections of Roman Catholics thereto.
- ED 10/146 National Assembly Measures, Office Instructions.
- ED 10/161 Consideration by the Board of Education of draft of National Society Supplementary Charter.
- ED 24 Confidential Minutes, Memoranda and Correspondence addressed to or emanating from the President or Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education and its Successors.
- / 72 The Training College Problem: Article by Sir James H. Yoxall, 1901.
- /464 Statement adopted at meeting of the Principals of Residential Colleges, 24.6.1905.
- /466 Memorandum as to grants for building in the case of Denominational Training Colleges, 24.6.1905.
- /482 Memorandum by Miss C.G. Luard on defects of the present system of training Elementary school teachers in Training Colleges.
- /484 Exclusion of students from Training Colleges 1907.
- /486 Memorandum by Miss Bannister on the well-being of students in Day Training Colleges 1909.
- /488 Memorandum on the 1907 Regulations from E.C. Whickham, Chairman of the Managing Committee, Lincoln.
- /489 Training College Regulations 1907, Extract from the School Guardian, 27.7.1907.
- /491 The St. Albans Compromise, 1907-1908.
- /492 Memorandum on Nonconformist students in a Residential College, 1908. R.L. Morant to President.
- /493 Correspondence concerning the case of a candidate excluded from Winchester, 1908.

- / 494 Copies of Minutes by H.M.I.s concerning Religious Instruction in Undenominational Training Colleges, 1909.
- /1685 Complaints against students of Leeds Training College concerning War Service.
- /1688 The Lord Derby Scheme, attestation and enlistment of Training College students.
- /1715 Letter on the powers of the Board of Education re. appointments to Training Colleges.
- /1814 Policy and action on the Report of the Departmental Committee on Training and Supply of Teachers.
- /1829 Deputation to President of Board of Education 1912 concerning Modus Vivendi.
- /1831 Withdrawal of Regulations on Religious Instruction in Training Colleges.
- /1833 Religious Training of Teachers 1917-1918. Federation of Church Training Colleges papers.
- /1920 1914 Emergency Measures at St. Mark's.
- /1925 1919 Continuation of Culham as a college for men.
- /1926 1920 Office Committee on Training College finances and organisation, December 1920.
- /1928 1925 Grants, fees and examinations. The position of Church of England Training Colleges.
- /1929 1926-31 Reconditioning of Church of England Colleges and loans for Church Training Colleges Measure 1931.
- /1934 1932-33 Economy Measures, Church of England Colleges.
- /1935 1933 Papers on Religious Instruction in Training Colleges.
- /1936 1933-34 Denominational Training College Papers.
- ED 86/ 2 Correspondence with Board of Education re. Purpose of Council of Principals of Training Colleges.
- / 7 1906-08 Draft of Training College Regulations 1907.

- ED 86/14 Representations regarding Circular 1372, 1926.
- /37 1923-28 Statements by interested parties on the
 Report of the Departmental Committee 1925.
- /43 Training College Inspectors' Conference,
 30.10.1931.
- /55 1917-22 The Church of England Establishment of
 a Board of Supervision.
- /56 Memoranda on the History of various Roman
 Catholic Colleges. Conference with represent-
 atives of Voluntary and L.E.A. Training Colleges
 with regard to fees, 14.12.1933.
- /57 British and Foreign School Society: Continuation
 of provision 1921-34.
- /60 1932-35 Church of England, discussions with
 Board of Supervision.
- /61 Westminster and Southlands Training Colleges,
 1932-33.
- ED 115/ 3 Full Inspection Report on Chester Training
 College, June 1922.
- / 9 Report of Inspection of Diocesan Training
 College, Exeter, November 1924.
- /10 Board of Education Report on Bede Training
 College, Durham, February 1926, based on
 enquiries made during past six years.
- /24 Report of Inspection of Winchester Training
 College, February 1926.
- /44 Chelsea, St. Mark and St. John, Inspection
 Report, January 1924.
- /52 St. Charles' Training College, Kensington,
 April 1926.
- /60 Westminster Training College, January 1925.
- /62 Whitelands Training College, Chelsea, May 1925.
- /73 Culham 1925-26.
- /79 Salisbury.
- /93 Full Inspection Report No. 20 January 1929,
 Carmarthen Training College.

D. College of St. Hild and St. Bede

Minutes of the Management Committee St. Hild's College,
1863, 1893, 1907.

Letters from students 1907-11 to M.V. Boyd, 1974.

Report of Joint Conference of Governing Bodies of the College
of the Venerable Bede and St. Hild's College, and corres-
pondence on scheme of Federation under a Board of Supervision,
1917-18.

Board of Supervision, Report of Interview with Governing Body
of St. Hild's College, 27.2.1930.

Correspondence with A. Harrison, Treasurer, St. Hild's College,
1932-36.

E. University of Durham

Minutes of the Council of the Durham Colleges 1919

F. Catholic Education Council

Correspondence 1903

G. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge

Minutes of the Standing Committee 1871-1874.

2. Annual Reports

Church Assembly: Reports of Proceedings, 1920-1949

Church Assembly: Minutes of Proceedings, 1921-1944

National Society: Reports, 1849, 1863-1864, 1869, 1871, 1875,
1876, 1878-1949

Wesleyan Committee of Education: Reports, 1900-1935

Methodist Education Committee: Reports, 1935-1945

Catholic School Committee: Reports, 1888-1904

Catholic Education Council: Reports, 1905-1945
Committee of Council on Education: Reports, 1884-85, 1890-99
Board of Education: Reports, 1899-1938
British and Foreign School Society: Annual Reports, 1891, 1903
Bede College: Annual Report, 1891
St. Hild's College: Annual Reports, 1896, 1903
Home and Colonial School Society: Report, 1924-25.

3. Church Assembly Publications

CAF 100 Central Board of Finance: First Interim Report for 1934: Training Colleges for Teachers
CAF 162 Central Board of Finance: Annual Report, 1939
CAF 208 Church Training College Finance: Report of Central Board of Finance pursuant to Assembly Minutes 359 and 360 of 1946
CA 590 Memorandum by Board of Supervision on Concentration October 1937
CA 812 The Church and Education 1946: The Report of the Archbishop's Commission (Selborne)
CA 931 The Development of the Church Training Colleges 1949: A Report by the Council of the Church Training Colleges
Mayor, R.G. (1929) Report on the Church of England Training Colleges for Teachers
Report of the Committee of Enquiry presented to the Board of Supervision, 16.12.1933
Council of the Church Training Colleges (1945) The Key to Christian Education: The Opportunities of the Church Training Colleges
Council of the Church Training Colleges: Report of sub-committee appointed 1.7.1943, submitted 4.11.1943 Confidential, for use of members of Governing Bodies only.

4. National Society Publications

Training College Commission (1916) Report to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury (Wakefield)

Joint Conference of Church Assembly Committee and National Society Standing Committee, 18.5.1931: Report

The Church Training Colleges (1943) Evidence submitted on behalf of the Board of Supervision to the Board of Education Committee on Teacher Training. Supplementary Evidence submitted to the Board of Supervision by the sub-committee appointed to prepare evidence for the McNair Committee.

The Fourth R (1970) The Report of the Commission on Religious Education in Schools (Durham) National Society and S.P.C.K.

5. Government Publications (all published by H.M.S.O.)

Reports, White Papers

1886-88 Royal Commission Appointed to Inquire into the Working of the Education Acts (Cross) Reports

1895 Royal Commission on Secondary Education (Bryce) Report

1898 Departmental Committee on the Pupil Teacher System: Report

1907 Board of Education: General Report on the Instruction and Training of Pupil Teachers, 1903-7

1925 Departmental Committee on the Training of Teachers for Public Elementary Schools (Burnham) Cmd. 2409. Report

1943 Board of Education: Educational Reconstruction. Cmd. 6458

1944 Board of Education: Teachers and Youth Leaders (McNair)

Report of the Committee Appointed to Consider the Supply, Recruitment and Training of Teachers and Youth Leaders

1951 Ministry of Education: Education 1900-1950. The Report of the Ministry of Education and the statistics of public education for England and Wales for the year 1950

Board of Education Regulations

- 1904 Regulations for the Training of Teachers and for the Examination of Students in Training Colleges
- 1907 Regulations for the Training of Teachers and for the Examination of Students in Training Colleges
- 1908 Regulations for the Training of Teachers for Elementary Schools
- 1909 Regulations for the Training of Teachers for Elementary Schools
- 1913 Regulations for the Preliminary Education of Elementary School Teachers
- 1919 Regulations for Secondary Schools
- 1920 Regulations for the Training of Teachers

Board of Education Circulars

- 570 Conditions of Admission, 1908, 23.8.1907
- 858 Extraordinary Expenditure or loss attributable to compliance with military requirements, 15.8.1914
- 863 Training College students and military service, 26.8.1914
- 878 Training College students and military service, 26.11.1914
- 895 Payment of a supplementary grant, 12.3.1914
- 928 Training College students and military service, 16.11.1915
- 946 Admission of men students to Training Colleges, 6.4.1916
- 1301 Restriction of admission to training colleges to prevent unemployment of teachers, 20.3.1923
- 1372 Examinations and Teacher Training, 11.12.1925
- 1420 Training Colleges, 4.8.1932
- 1423 Regulations for the Training of Teachers, 1933, 9.11. 1932

- 1430 Training Colleges (reduction of student numbers proposed), 21.7.1933
- 1621 Reservation of men students admitted to training colleges in 1941, 1942 and 1943, 15.2.1943
- 1625 Minimum Age of Admission for Women Students to training colleges, 16.3.1943

SECONDARY SOURCES

1. Theses

- | | | |
|--------------|------|--|
| Allatt, C.S. | 1970 | 'The History of St. Peter's College, Saltley, from 1850 to 1900 with particular reference to the syllabus' Dissertation for the Diploma in Education, Birmingham. |
| Bevan, B.D. | 1970 | 'History of the College of Sarum St. Michael (Salisbury Training College) from its foundation in 1841 until 1902' M.A. Thesis, London. |
| Boyd, M.V. | 1977 | 'Teacher Training at St. Hild's College, Durham, 1858-1910' M.Ed. Thesis, Durham. |
| Cullen, M.M. | 1964 | 'The Growth of the Roman Catholic Training Colleges for Women in England during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries' M.Ed. Thesis, Durham. |
| Elmes, D.S. | 1969 | 'A Study of the Development of Voluntary training colleges for teachers, with special reference to Fishponds Diocesan College, Bristol, later known as the College of St. Matthias' M.Ed. Thesis, Bristol. |

- | | | |
|-----------------|------|--|
| Etherington, W. | 1969 | 'A History of St. John's College, York, 1841-1914'
M.Ed. Thesis, Leicester. |
| Fuller, F.W.T. | 1971 | 'The History of St. Luke's College, Exeter, 1839-1970'
M.Litt. Thesis, Bristol. |
| Goss, M.G. | 1950 | 'The Development of University participation in the training of teachers in England and Wales'
M.A. Thesis, London. |
| Hewlett, E.L. | 1932 | 'The work of the British and Foreign School Society in the Training of Teachers'
M.Ed. Thesis, Manchester. |
| Pomfret, A. | 1969 | 'The reaction of the Established Church to educational legislation 1918-1959'
M.A. in Education Thesis, London. |
| Shakoor, A. | 1969 | 'The Training of Teachers in England and Wales 1900-1939'
Ph.D. Thesis, Leicester. |
| Warwick, D.W. | 1966 | 'The Colleges of St. Mark and St. John: their history as illustrating the development of teacher training in this country to 1926'
M.A. Thesis, London. |

2. Pamphlets and Articles

- | | | |
|------------------|------|--|
| Armytage, W.H.G. | 1954 | <u>The role of an Education Department in a Modern University</u> Inaugural Lecture, 8.12.1954
University of Sheffield. |
| Dent, H.C. | 1976 | 'Unprecedented Expansion: Post-war trends in teacher education'
<u>Canterbury Chapters</u> , ed. M. Berry and J.H. Higginson.
Canterbury, Christ Church College. |

- | | | |
|-----------------------|------|---|
| Doyle, J. | 1929 | 'The Catholic Colleges'
<u>The Tablet</u> , Vol. CLIV, pp.
448-450. |
| Ellis, G.S.M. (ed.) | 1922 | <u>The Training of Teachers</u>
T.U.C. and Labour Party. |
| Fairchild, J. | 1938 | <u>History of the Church</u>
<u>Training College at Caernarvon</u>
<u>and Bangor</u>
Bangor, Jarvis and Foster. |
| Goodings, R.F. | 1958 | 'The London Day Training
College'
<u>Education Libraries Bulletin</u> ,
No. 2, 1958, pp. 2-8, No. 3,
1958, pp. 2-7, No. 4, 1959,
pp. 21-28. |
| Humphreys, D.W. | 1965 | <u>The Relationship between the</u>
<u>Training Colleges and the</u>
<u>Universities before McNair</u>
Bristol, University of Bristol
Institute of Education. |
| Knights, L.C. | 1932 | 'Will Training Colleges bear
Scrutiny?'
<u>Scrutiny</u> , Vol. I, No. 3, pp.
247-263. |
| London County Council | 1903 | <u>London County Council Day</u>
<u>Training College attached to</u>
<u>London University</u> March 1903
London County Council. |
| Meredith, R. | 1946 | 'Early History of the North
Wales Training College'
<u>Transactions of the Caernar-</u>
<u>vonshire Historical Society</u> |
| Sadler, M.E. | 1908 | <u>The Training of Teachers</u>
Paper to Pan Anglican Congress,
Section C, 20.6.1908. |
| Thomas, J.B. | 1978 | 'The Day Training College: A
Victorian Innovation in teacher
training'
<u>British Journal of Teacher</u>
<u>Education</u> , Vol. 4, No. 3,
October 1978. |

- Tomlinson, L. 1968 'Oxford University and the Training of Teachers: the early years 1892-1921' British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. XVI, No. 3.
- Tuck, J.P. 1973 'From Day Training College to University Department of Education' The Education of Teachers in Britain, ed. D.E. Lomax. John Wiley and Sons.

3. Books

- Allen, B.M. 1934 Sir Robert Morant: A Great Public Servant Macmillan.
- Barnes, H. (ed.) 1891 Training Colleges for Schoolmistresses Howarth Barnes.
- Bartle, G.F. 1976 A History of Borough Road College Isleworth, The College.
- Beck, W.E. 1947 A History of the Cheltenham Training Colleges, St. Paul and St. Mary Bath, Dawson and Goodall.
- Bell, G.K.A. 1935 Randall Davidson Oxford University Press.
- Binns, H.B. 1908 A Century of Education Dent.
- Birchenough, C. 1929 History of Elementary Education in England and Wales from 1900 to the present day University Tutorial Press.
- Bradbury, J.L. 1975 Chester College, 1839-1975 Denbigh, The Governors of Chester College.
- Brown, C.K.F. 1942 The Church's Part in Education 1833-1941 Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

- | | | |
|------------------------|------|--|
| Brown, M.G. | 1938 | <u>Training in Truro, 1813-1938.</u>
<u>A hundred and twenty-five years</u>
<u>of educational experiment</u>
Coatbridge, Alex Pettigrew. |
| Browne, J.D. | 1979 | <u>Teachers of Teachers</u>
Hodder and Stoughton. |
| Burgess, H.J. | 1958 | <u>Enterprise in Education</u>
National Society and Society
for Promoting Christian
Knowledge. |
| Carrigan, D.A. | 1961 | <u>The Catholic Teachers' Colleges</u>
<u>in the United Kingdom, 1850-</u>
<u>1960</u>
Washington D.C. The Catholic
University of America Press. |
| Chadwick, O. | 1966 | <u>The Victorian Church</u> Part I
A. and C. Black. |
| Challinor, E.B. | 1978 | <u>The Story of St. Mary's College,</u>
<u>Cheltenham</u>
Cheltenham, the author. |
| Clarke, W.K.L. | 1959 | <u>A History of the S.P.C.K.</u>
Society for Promoting Christian
Knowledge. |
| Cruickshank, M. | 1963 | <u>Church and State in English</u>
<u>Education</u>
Macmillan. |
| Dent, H.C. | 1975 | <u>The Training of Teachers in</u>
<u>England and Wales, 1800-1975</u>
Hodder and Stoughton. |
| Dobson, M. | 1951 | <u>The History of the first</u>
<u>hundred years of the Diocesan</u>
<u>Training College, Derby</u>
West Bromwich, Kenrick and
Jefferson. |
| Faunthorpe, J.P. (ed.) | 1891 | <u>Whitelands College Jubilee</u>
<u>Report</u>
Putney, The College. |
| Gosden, P.H.J.H. | 1972 | <u>The Evolution of a Profession</u>
Oxford, Basil Blackwell. |
| Gosden, P.H.J.H. | 1976 | <u>Education in the Second World</u>
<u>War</u>
Methuen. |

- | | | |
|-------------------|------|--|
| Grier, L. | 1937 | <u>The Life of Winifred Mercier</u>
Oxford University Press. |
| Handley, G. | 1978 | <u>The College of All Saints,</u>
<u>1878-1978</u>
The College. |
| Horn, P. | 1978 | <u>Education in Rural England,</u>
<u>1800-1914</u>
New York, St. Martin's Press. |
| Huxley, E. | 1968 | <u>Love Among the Daughters</u>
Chatto and Windus. |
| Iremonger, F.A. | 1948 | <u>William Temple, Archbishop of</u>
<u>Canterbury</u>
Oxford University Press. |
| Johnson, C.M.B. | 1957 | <u>Keswick Hall, 1817-1957</u>
Norwich, The College. |
| Jones, L. | 1924 | <u>The Training of Teachers</u>
Oxford University Press. |
| Lawrence, A.L. | 1958 | <u>St. Hild's College, 1858-1958</u>
Durham, The College. |
| Lloyd, R. | 1966 | <u>The Church of England, 1900-</u>
<u>1965</u>
Student Christian Movement
Press. |
| Lomax, D.E. (ed.) | 1973 | <u>The Education of Teachers in</u>
<u>Britain</u>
John Wiley and Sons. |
| Lynch, J. | 1979 | <u>The Reform of Teacher Education</u>
<u>in the United Kingdom</u>
Sturminster Newton, Society
for Research into Higher Education. |
| McGregor, C.P. | 1981 | <u>Bishop Otter College, 1839-1980</u>
<u>and policy for teacher education</u>
Pembroke Press. |
| Matthews, H.F. | 1949 | <u>Methodism and the Education of</u>
<u>the People</u>
Epworth Press. |
| Murphy, J. | 1971 | <u>Church, State and Schools in</u>
<u>Britain, 1800-1970</u>
Routledge and Kegan Paul. |

- | | | |
|--|------|---|
| Naylor, L. | 1953 | <u>Culham Church of England
Training College for School-
masters 1853-1953, Centenary
History</u>
Abingdon, Abbey Press. |
| Niblett, W.R.,
Humphreys, D.W. and
Fairhurst, J.R. | 1975 | <u>The University Connection
Windsor, National Foundation
for Educational Research
Publishing Co.</u> |
| Ogren, G. | 1953 | <u>Trends in English Teacher
Training from 1800: a survey
and an investigation</u>
Stockholm, Esselte. |
| Osborne, J. (ed.) | 1950 | <u>Saltley College Centenary,
1850-1950</u>
Tunbridge Wells, The College. |
| Partington, G. | 1976 | <u>Women Teachers in the Twentieth
Century</u>
Windsor, National Foundation
for Educational Research
Publishing Co. |
| Pritchard, F.C. | 1951 | <u>The Story of Westminster
College, 1851-1951</u>
Epworth Press. |
| Purcell, W. | 1969 | <u>Fisher of Lambeth</u>
Hodder and Stoughton. |
| Rich, R.W. | 1933 | <u>The Training of Teachers in
England and Wales during the
nineteenth century</u>
Cambridge University Press. |
| Rose, M. | 1981 | <u>A History of King Alfred's
College, Winchester, 1840-1980</u>
Chichester, Phillimore and Co.
Ltd. |
| Sacks, B. | 1961 | <u>The Religious Issue in the
State Schools of England and
Wales, 1902-14</u>
New Mexico, University of New
Mexico Press. |
| Sandford, E.G. (ed.) | 1906 | <u>Memoirs of Frederick Temple</u>
Macmillan. |

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|--|
| Sandiford, P. | 1910 | <u>The training of teachers in England and Wales</u>
New York, Teachers' College, Columbia University. |
| Seaman, R.D.H. | 1978 | <u>St. Peter's Saltley, 1944-1978</u>
Birmingham, The College. |
| Shipley, E.B. (ed.) | 1962-7 | <u>The History of King Alfred's Winchester</u>
typescript, King Alfred's College Library. |
| Simon, B. | 1965 | <u>Education and the Labour Movement, 1870-1920</u>
Lawrence and Wishart. |
| Spencer, F.H. | 1938 | <u>An Inspector's Testament</u>
English Universities Press. |
| St. Mary's College | 1950 | <u>Centenary Record of St. Mary's College, Hammersmith, 1850-1925, Strawberry Hill 1925-1950</u>
Twickenham, The College. |
| Stanton, O.M. | 1966 | <u>Our Present Opportunities, the History of Darlington College of Education (Darlington Training College)</u>
Darlington, the author. |
| Tattersfield, C.R. | 1978 | <u>St. Luke's College, 1839-1978</u>
Exeter, The College. |
| Taylor, W. | 1969 | <u>Society and the Education of Teachers</u>
Faber. |
| Tropp, A. | 1957 | <u>The School Teachers</u>
Heinemann. |
| Tyson, J.C. and
Tuck, J.P. | 1971 | <u>The Origins and Development of the Training of Teachers in the University of Newcastle upon Tyne</u>
Newcastle upon Tyne, Department of Education. |
| Watson, R.S. | 1897 | <u>The History of the Literary and Philosophical Society Newcastle upon Tyne</u>
Walter Scott. |

- | | | |
|-----------------|------|--|
| Webster, D.E. | 1973 | <u>Bede College: A Commentary</u>
Durham, The College. |
| Wilkinson, A. | 1978 | <u>The Church of England and the First World War</u>
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. |
| Wilkinson, A.M. | 1963 | <u>Ripon Training College, 1862-1962, the first hundred years</u>
Ripon, The College. |
| Williams, E. | 1972 | <u>The History of Southlands College, 1872-1972</u>
Wimbledon, The College. |
| Willis, T.G. | 1928 | <u>Records of Chichester</u>
Chichester, Willis Press. |
| Wood, G.A. | 1938 | <u>History of Hockerill Training College</u>
Bishopbriggs, J.L. Paterson. |
| Zebedee, D.H.J. | 1962 | <u>Lincoln Training College, 1862-1962</u>
Lincoln, The College. |

4. Reference Books

- | | | |
|---|----------------------|--|
| <u>Crockford's Clerical Directory</u> | 1910
1929, | Horace Cox.
1931, 1941, 1947 Oxford University Press. |
| Henstridge, H. | 1979 | <u>Whitelands College Archive Catalogue</u>
The College. |
| <u>The Official Year Book of the Church of England</u> | 1890-1922 | Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. |
| <u>The Official Year Book of the National Assembly of the Church of England</u> | 1923-1950 | Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. |
| Venn, J.A. | 1922-1954 | <u>Alumni Cantabrigienses</u>
Part II, 1752-1900
Cambridge University Press. |
| <u>Who Was Who</u> | 1952
1961
1972 | Vol. IV
Vol. V
Vol. VI
A. and C. Black. |

